Volume XLIII] *January, 1938* [*Number 2*

The American Historical Review

JOHN FRANKLIN JAMESON

With the death of Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, on September 28 last, there passed from our midst the master whose far-ranging services to the cause of history had given him a unique position in our profession, a position all the more unassailable because it was unsought, unclaimed, and unofficial.[1] We shall not see his like again, if only because the circumstances under which his work was done will never recur. He had no predecessor, and he will have no successor.

Jameson was born near Boston on September 19, 1859. From the Roxbury Latin School, where he received his early education, he went to Amherst and was graduated in the class of 1879. In college he developed what was to remain his dominant interest through life, and he decided to prepare himself for the career of a professor of history at a time when there were few university chairs in that subject in the United States. With this object in view he entered the recently founded Johns Hopkins University, where he studied under the guidance of Herbert B. Adams and received the doctorate in 1882. He remained at Hopkins, as assistant and associate in history, for six years. In 1888 he was appointed Professor of History in Brown University and served in that position till 1901, when he was called to the University of Chicago to succeed Hermann Eduard von Holst as Professor and Head of the Department of History. In 1905 he was appointed Director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington and held that office until his retirement from it in 1928, when, in his seventieth year, he became Chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress and first incumbent of its newly established chair of American history. He never gave up active work. In the spring of 1937 he suffered a severe accident while crossing a street in Washington, but after a period of pain and tedious inertia, borne with philosophical resignation and great good humor, he was

[1] This memoir is based upon information and comment generously given by a number of Dr. Jameson's former students and associates.

able, though still on crutches, to resume his work, and his colleagues in the Library of Congress looked forward to years of continued association with him. His final illness, an attack of pneumonia, was brief. He died virtually in harness.

When young Jameson decided to make history his life work the historical profession in this country was just coming into existence. There were probably not more than fifteen persons of professorial rank in the United States who were giving all their time to history. It was still a wide-spread opinion in college and university circles that history, in so far as it ought to be taught at all, should be auxiliary to some other subject. It was not until 1884 that a group of scholars and friends of history, meeting at Saratoga, established the American Historical Association, which was to become the most effective agency in the advancement of American historical scholarship. In the list of its original members Jameson's name appears with those of such older scholars as Charles Kendall Adams, Mellen Chamberlain, Moses Coit Tyler, Andrew D. White, and Justin Winsor; more nearly his contemporaries but still his seniors were Herbert B. Adams, to whom chief credit belongs for the conception of a nation-wide historical organization, Ephraim Emerton, and Edward Channing. Throughout the history of the Association Jameson was its most continuously active and devoted member. Recognition came to him in his election to the Executive Council in 1900. In 1904 he was elected Second Vice-President of the Association and so, in due course, became President in 1907. Thereafter, as ex-President, he continued to be an active member of the council and to render many and invaluable services. His keen interest in the affairs of the Association never flagged, and he attended the annual meetings and the meetings of the council with a regularity reminiscent of his Puritan ancestors' churchgoing. The accounts of the annual meetings that he wrote for the April numbers of the *American Historical Review* constitute an informing and thoughtful commentary, lit up by occasional flashes of dry humor, on the progress of historical studies in the United States. His interest in the younger members of the Association, probably unknown to most of them, was always keen. He realized the importance of their work for the future of the historical profession. An evidence of this interest was the compilation which he began, as a personal enterprise, of the lists of doctoral dissertations in progress, and which he edited year after year for the benefit of the graduate schools of the country until it reached its present rather alarming proportions.

Jameson was never content merely to "carry on". His associates were impressed by his extraordinary and unselfish zeal in initiating enterprises for the advancement of historical research and publication. He was always ready to co-operate with others in every sort of legitimate historical activity and to serve, often as chairman, on committees, commissions, and councils and as delegate of the American Historical Association in such bodies as the American Council of Learned Societies and in such gatherings as international historical congresses abroad. It may truthfully be said that there was nothing in the field of historical endeavor that was alien to him or that lay beyond the range of what he considered to be his obligation to his chosen subject.

One of his early papers urged the inclusion in the *Annual Reports* of the American Historical Association of important manuscript material, and when, through his initiative, the Association established its Historical Manuscripts Commission it was natural that he should be chosen its first chairman. Like its prototype, the Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission of Great Britain, it rendered service of highest value in the preservation and calendaring of important sources of American history. Among the series of documents edited by Jameson while he was chairman of the commission are the letters of Phineas Bond, Stephen Higginson, and John C. Calhoun, for which he wrote valuable introductions.

While Jameson was in Chicago he served as chairman of an advisory committee on history appointed by the trustees of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and in the report which he submitted he outlined the functions and activities of a national institute of historical research. Such an institute was created as a department of the Carnegie Institution, and Jameson became its head in 1905, succeeding Andrew C. McLaughlin, who had been its organizing director. The decision to accept this position involved more than the abandonment of a teaching career; it meant that there would henceforth be little opportunity for his own researches, but Jameson believed that the opportunity thus given him to promote historical studies on a national scale would be ample compensation.

As Director of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution Jameson carried forward with his usual thoroughness and wisdom a program which has had far-reaching results. In the first place he gave effect to a plan which had already been conceived, largely in his own mind, for the systematic exploration of the archives and other historical depositories of foreign countries for the discovery of

materials on American history. The result was the well-known and invaluable series of published *Guides* to materials in Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Russia, Canada, Mexico, and Cuba and the West Indies; and information was gathered, although it has not as yet been published, in the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries. A direct result of these explorations was the transcription of selected documents in foreign archives for deposit in the Library of Congress. The great extension of this work, made possible by photography and the generosity of Mr. Rockefeller, has brought to the library an unparalleled collection of materials, increasing manyfold the opportunities for research in American history in this country. Another major part of Jameson's program took form in important documentary publications, which bear upon American history at many points. These include Letters of Members of the Continental Congress; Proceedings and Debates of the British [including the Scottish and the Irish] Parliaments respecting North America; European Treaties relating to the History of the United States and its Dependencies; Judicial Cases relating to Slavery; Documents illustrative of the Slave Trade in the United States; Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. Jameson himself acted as General Editor of the series of Original Narratives of Early American History, to which he contributed three volumes. This series placed within the reach of libraries of modest size materials previously available only in a few large collections. The authorities of the Carnegie Institution were not favorably disposed toward bibliography, and after supporting for a year or two the annual *Writings on American History* they left this enterprise on his hands as a personal obligation. For more than a quarter of a century he collected from year to year and from many sources the funds necessary to sustain this indispensable tool of American historical scholarship. He contributed a volume of documents on privateering and piracy to the series issued under the auspices of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America, a society to which he was always a valued adviser. The explanatory notes which he supplied are characterized by extraordinary learning and ingenuity.

Jameson's vision included a dictionary of American biography, comparable in scope and standards to the British *Dictionary of National Biography*, as a possible achievement of his department, but in the end it was the American Council of Learned Societies that sponsored this colossal project. As delegate of the American Historical Association in the Council he proposed that that body should undertake this enter-

prise. The Council encouraged him to perfect his plans and, being itself without available financial resources, to seek funds for carrying them out. After heroic exertions on his part, a benefactor appeared in the person of the late Adolph Ochs of the *New York Times,* who gave generous financial support to the enterprise. As Chairman of the Committee of Management Jameson saw *The Dictionary of American Biography* through to its successful completion in twenty volumes. His part in the enterprise is indicated in the "Brief Account" prefixed to the last volume. The carrying through of such projects as have been mentioned involved correspondence and conference and the expenditure of thought and time the extent of which it is not easy to comprehend.

Jameson was indefatigable in his efforts to arouse the government of the United States from its lethargy as regards both the preservation and the printing of its archival material. In a paper published as early as 1891, "The Expenditures of Foreign Governments for History", he called attention to the backwardness of our Federal government in making appropriations for historical purposes, a subject to which he returned in an article published in 1906, entitled "Gaps in the Published Records of United States History". He served on committees appointed to consider the question of the documentary publications of the United States, including that of 1907-8, appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in connection with the work of a committee on department methods, whose report was printed by the government but afterwards shelved. Jameson was the prime mover and the most devoted worker in the long campaign to educate officials and legislators and the public to a realization of the importance of adequate provision for the records of the Federal government. In season and out of season, for more than a quarter of a century, he labored to win support for this cause. Happily he lived to see the National Archives building, which now stands on Pennsylvania Avenue, "as much a monument to Jameson", it has been said, "as if it were named for him". An important provision of the National Archives Act of 1934, largely the result of his patient, persistent efforts, is that which established, as a permanent part of the National Archives organization, the Advisory Commission on Documentary Historical Publications of the United States, looking toward a carefully considered program of publication to replace the haphazard procedure of the past.

As Chief of the Division of Manuscripts and occupant of the chair of American History in the Library of Congress Jameson was chiefly

concerned with building up its collections of original sources. He nearly doubled the holdings of the Division of Manuscripts and added greatly to the collections of books in the field of American history. The manuscript accessions for which he was responsible were in all fields of American history, but he gave special attention to adding to the papers of the Presidents and Cabinet officers. Thus he succeeded in securing the papers of Garfield, McKinley, Wilson, Coolidge, Blaine, Root, Knox, Bryan, and Lansing, and he added to the papers of Monroe, the Harrisons, and Taft. The innumerable services that he performed personally for the benefit of scholars and of the general public made the Division of Manuscripts the most important central agency of the country for research and information in American history.

The extent and variety of Jameson's achievements is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that for nearly twenty-five years he was actively engaged in teaching. His longest period of service was at Brown. In the able faculty assembled there by President E. Benjamin Andrews, Jameson was easily a leader by right of intellectual caliber and personal character. His quality of leadership was emphasized in 1897, when he headed a protest by the faculty against the resignation of President Andrews because of dissatisfaction with his economic views on the part of the corporation. The memorial that Jameson drew up is one of the important documents in the history of academic freedom and resulted in a request from the corporation to the president to withdraw his resignation. "Jamie's history" was reputed to be one of the exacting and difficult courses in the college curriculum, but those students who had the courage to take it look back upon it as an inspiring experience. Behind the austere and rather stern expression that "Jamie" habitually wore they discerned a wealth of wisdom, a far-seeing philosophy, and an unexpected fund of humor. His personal interest in his students was very keen, and in countless ways he showed himself to be their friend and won their affection. It is a noteworthy testimonial to his influence that a substantial number of his undergraduate students of the 90's followed careers into which he had initiated them. Among these may be mentioned Dean Marshall S. Brown of New York University, Edmund C. Burnett of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Champlin Burrage, long librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, the late Professor Carl Russell Fish and the late Dr. Charles McCarthy of the University of Wisconsin, Harold D. Hazeltine, Downing Professor of the Laws of England and successor to Maitland in Cambridge University, Professor Marcus W. Jernegan of

the University of Chicago, Dr. Waldo G. Leland, Director of the American Council of Learned Societies, and Dr. Mary E. Woolley, President Emeritus of Mount Holyoke College.

Jameson's four years at Chicago, when he was in his early forties, gave evidence of his influence upon older students. As a lecturer he was formal, and his delivery was not enlivening, but upperclassmen and especially the many graduate students who came in contact with him could not fail to recognize his faultless scholarship and his remarkable command of languages, to appreciate the zeal with which he pursued his own investigations, and to be attracted by a subtle humor and a kindliness that an outwardly austere personality could not obscure. His accuracy, intellectual integrity, and thoroughness set a standard that aroused in his more mature students a devotion which time served only to deepen. He had in marked degree a gift for intellectual companionship with his students. He was respectful of their opinions and of their knowledge of subjects under investigation, and he was sincerely interested in their achievements. "I think it was this gracious and thoroughly sincere attitude on the part of Dr. Jameson", writes one of his former students at Chicago, "that made his graduate students such devoted followers". Although his teaching was confined to American history, he was never a narrow specialist, unduly impressed with the importance of his own field. On the contrary, he succeeded in inducing his students to maintain a catholicity of mind regarding all fields of history. As Head of the Department of History at Chicago, it may be added, he had a great influence upon his colleagues also.

Jameson rendered one of his most important services to the cause of history in the United States as Managing Editor of the *American Historical Review,* in which capacity he served for nearly thirty years—from the founding of the *Review* in 1895 to 1901 and again from 1905 to 1928. The very first number set a standard in the quality of its articles and reviews and in the editorial skill disclosed that might well have made it the despair of Dr. Jameson's successors. A list of the contributors could pass as an honor roll of American historians in 1895. It includes Henry Adams, Herbert B. Adams, Charles M. Andrews, Simeon E. Baldwin, John Bigelow, Edward Gaylord Bourne, Theodore Ayrault Dodge, William A. Dunning, Herbert Friedenwald, Charles H. Haskins, Harry Pratt Judson, Henry C. Lea, Charles H. Levermore, John Bassett Moore, James Harvey Robinson, Theodore Roosevelt, Edward M. Shepard, William M. Sloane, Goldwin Smith,

Charlemagne Tower, Frederick Jackson Turner, Lyon G. Tyler, Moses Coit Tyler, and William B. Weeden. It is unnecessary to particularize as to the demands made upon the editor of a historical journal. Articles must be accepted with care and discretion, often with suggestions for further research and for improvements in substance and form, and rejected with tact; qualified scholars must be chosen to write reviews; absolute accuracy in statement must be diligently striven for, since even eminent historians sometimes nod; obscure passages must be clarified, inconsistencies eliminated, and marked infelicities of style removed. In some instances, articles submitted to the *Review* Dr. Jameson made his own in a measure by careful editing and enlargement, generally in the footnotes. The documents published in the *Review* were often selected and edited by him, and especially in the early years, when the art of handling the raw materials of history was not taught as it is today in countless university seminars, this was of great value. Jameson made the *Review* not only a vehicle for historical publication and criticism but a clearinghouse for historical ideas and enterprises, and through it he exerted a powerful and beneficial influence upon the historical profession, which was of the utmost importance at a time when younger men and women were entering it in numbers. To his pre-eminent qualifications for the higher ranges of editorial work Jameson added a capacity for taking infinite pains. Proof was read with conscientious care, no detail was so trivial that it escaped his attention, none of the minutiae, so trying and unrelenting in their demands, was slighted.

Nobody who knows the quality of Jameson's mind and his methods of research doubts that he could have produced a monumental work of historical scholarship had he been free to devote himself to it over a considerable period of time, though nobody who has the interests of history at heart would wish that he had done so at the expense of the more important work which he did accomplish. He once wrote, overmodestly, that he had been obliged to spread himself out thin by giving his attention now to this historical matter and now to that, but he was as nearly selfless as a man can be, and he made the personal sacrifice to the greater good not only willingly but gladly. He possessed in eminent degree the capacities and qualities of the historian: an ability to amass, digest, and draw sound conclusions from great stores of evidence; a memory of extraordinary retentiveness that made it an act of audacity ever to question the accuracy of his statements; an

exceptional degree of freedom from distorting bias; a penetrating understanding of men and motives, never contaminated, happily, by the cheap vogue of "debunking"; a highly developed critical judgment, constantly manifested in his writings; and a chastened prose style which, somewhat severe in its simplicity but always adequate as the vehicle for the conveyance of his thought, permitted occasional flashes of that dry humor which his intimates knew well. His reverence for Clio did not exclude such delightfully satirical bits as these: that Plymouth Rock, to many of the older New England writers, "underlay the whole geological formation of the United States"; that Cotton Mather's ministrations at an execution at Boston added "a new horror" to a pirate's dread of death, although to Mather "the whole occasion was one of extraordinary enjoyment"; that certain articles written by generals who had taken part in battles of the Civil War were like that "piece of firework known as the St. Catherine's Wheel, which went round and round in the same circle spitting out fire".

A complete list of Jameson's writing would be a long one, amazingly so in view of his other achievements in behalf of history. Exclusive of a large number of reviews, in some of which his critical powers are shown at their best, it would include books in the field of American colonial and Revolutionary history and of historiography; introductions, which are often learned disquisitions, to collections of documents and other works of which he was editor; and studies, in the form of articles, reports, and lectures, in local American history and government, in constitutional, political, social, and religious history, in biography, in historical and textual criticism, on archival and other historical records, on historical societies, and on the uses and the teaching of history. A complete bibliography of Jameson ought to be compiled. It might well be appended to a collection of his articles and papers, which, it is to be hoped, may soon be published.

The number of those who were inspired to historical work by Dr. Jameson and who received assistance and encouragement from him is legion. He was never too busy to confer with fellow historians and students or to answer letters of inquiry, which came to him from all quarters. Many a doctoral dissertation had its origin in some suggestion of his fertile mind; and many a student, both mature historian and young researcher, gratefully recalls his counsel and aid. He mapped out subjects and groups of subjects which he thought deserving of attention and pointed out gaps that ought to be filled, subjects

that ought to be revised, and topics that called for reconsideration. For more than forty years he was guide, philosopher, and friend to the historical fraternity at large.

Universities and learned societies honored themselves by bestowing their honors on Dr. Jameson, and many were offered to him which, for one reason or another, he was unable to accept. Amherst, Johns Hopkins, and Michigan conferred on him the degree of doctor of laws; Brown and Princeton, the degree of doctor of letters; and Cambridge invited him to receive the degree of doctor of letters, but he was unable to journey to England at the time to accept it. He was elected to membership in the Massachusetts Historical Society and the American Philosophical Society and to corresponding membership in the Royal Historical Society of Great Britain, the British Academy, and the Royal Academy of Belgium.

With all his exacting and unremitting labors, Jameson was never in a hurry, his serenity was never ruffled, his speech was never other than deliberate. He found time—though one wonders how—for wide reading outside the field of history, not disdaining the light and the humorous. He was not demonstrative in the expression of his feelings, but association with congenial spirits was always a joy to him. Many members of the American Historical Association recall the yearly September gatherings at Owenego House in Branford of what he called the "Convivium Historicum", instituted by him more than twenty years ago. He had an inexhaustible fund of anecdotes which he could tell in an inimitable manner, and he was ready with an original poem for any occasion. He was a great walker, not a fair-weather stroller but a seasoned hiker whose outings, often taken in company with his old friend, Professor Francis A. Christie, were likely to last from three to ten days. Like Disraeli, whom in most respects he resembled not at all, he liked to strew flowers along the road of a busy life.

Those who knew him well not only respected and admired him—they loved him. To his colleagues in the Library of Congress and to his intimates in the American Historical Association, as well as to other friends and to the members of his family, his death brought the sense of deep personal bereavement.

SOME SUGGESTIONS TO AMERICAN HISTORIANS[1]

THE nominating committee who three years ago put your present president's name on the slowly turning wheel of official preferment failed to read the historical horoscope or to check the date 1937 against its implications and obligations for the one who gave your annual address that year. This year, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States, brings to this platform one who is not a specialist in American history and much less a student of the narrower and neglected field of American constitutional history.

The program committee has properly taken cognizance of your president's limitations and of the significance of the occasion. In the conferences and papers of the last few days the Constitution has been put through its paces and over many hurdles. I am glad to assure you that it still survives and that the Federal judiciary will not have to join the ranks of the unemployed. After the recent past the Constitution may be slightly apprehensive as it still faces a series of congressionally inspired state celebrations, ending with Rhode Island's gracious public confession that it is and has been part of the Union for a century and a half. Speaking sympathetically for the Constitution, I may say that it hopes nevertheless that at the end of another one hundred and fifty years it will still be able to speak its mother tongue, the language of ordered government translated into the idiom of an ever-changing and dynamic American society.

Despite the entire adequacy of the program, it is the inescapable obligation of the only speaker whose remarks, irrespective of their merit, are sure to be published to take some notice before a national historical society of the occasion that brings us together at the end of this memorial year in a city rich in historical associations beyond even the framing of the Constitution.

Certainly the drafting of the Constitution is a cardinal event in the relatively brief history of the nation. As an experiment in a governmental structure built around what might easily have become a rigid framework, it is unique and long lived. Like Talleyrand, who, when

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the American Historical Association at Philadelphia on December 30, 1937.

asked what he had done during the French Revolution, replied, "I lived through it", the Constitution may proclaim with pride that it has lived through the revolutionary changes in the social and economic conditions of the one hundred and fifty years that have transformed thirteen Atlantic seaboard colonies into a nation of vast extent, varied and conflicting interests, and world-wide influence upon the present and future of mankind. This persistence amid the failure of scores of imitations in other lands is the outstanding feature to one who approaches the American constitutional experiment from the standpoint of studies in the modern history of other lands. The complete measure of the importance the American Constitution has obtained is so bound up with the development, expansion, and power of our own nation that it is untimely to say that in world history it will persist longer or be of more influence as a basis for organized society than the much older constitution of England or the theoretic bases supplied by the French Declaration of the Rights of Man or by the Communist Manifesto, to mention only documents in the field of social polity.

Many students of the determining factors in modern civilization would ask us to consider the pervading, even dominating, influence of the contributions made by science and invention. In their opinion these dwarf all instruments of government in their effects upon modern society. As all things are relative when viewed from the historical point of view, students of American history would have to listen to the case that could be made for the influence of science and technology and would agree in the end, I suspect, that it was strong if not convincing. Certainly no one can review in a realistic way our history in the constitutional period and conclude that the past history or future fate of the Constitution has been or will be determined apart from the influence of the industrial revolution whose beginnings are coincident with the formation of constitutional government. To the revolution in the world's economic life and social pattern since 1787 must be added the potent effect upon our thinking produced by the development of the sciences that gave it birth and sustained its furious growth. The result of science has been not only to condition the physical man but to furnish his mind with new thoughts, give him a method by which to think them, and shape the folkways to which laws and institutions must ultimately conform.

In what I have just said or suggested about the influences that have played upon our own and world history since the making of the Constitution my thought has not strayed far from this city. Ill fed and

emaciated indeed must be the historical imagination of him who can walk Philadelphia streets, enter the halls of its historic buildings, or face its monuments without reconstructing a nation's past and seeking to distill from what has been, the essence of what is yet to be. It is a broad and nobly peopled way that winds from the Philadelphia of William Penn's day to this brief memorial moment. They who throng it are not alone the authors of the Federal Constitution. With them walk the arbiters of peace and war in national crises, the advocates of liberty and the founders of ordered government, the pioneers of science, education, and national economy, and the fearless advocates of toleration and emancipation. It is a noble company, seldom paralleled in the life of any city. Even those colonial and early national leaders who came from New England and Virginia are associated indelibly with Philadelphia and the nation. John Adams and Washington and Madison are first remembered not as belonging to Massachusetts and Virginia but as the nation's representatives in Philadelphia. When we look at this procession we see in Benjamin Franklin not alone the statesman and epitome of the eighteenth century but the scientist whose contributions are early harbingers of the science and inventions that are remaking the nation and testing the Constitution he helped to found or formulate.

If the historian takes notice of science as a factor he must reckon with, it is too often of physical science alone. He overlooks the vast fields of biology, paleontology, and comparative anatomy which have revolutionized man's attitude toward himself and his place in time, measured by the aeons that are moments in geologic time. In this revolution there is one outstanding American figure who walks with Franklin, the physicist. It is Joseph Leidy, the last great naturalist, whose basic contribution ranged from parasitology to paleontology, from the protozoa to man. He opened the door to a past on this continent so infinite in its perspective that in the chronology of the gods it reduces all we say in commemoration of a century and a half to a line entry. I commend to historians that among thoughtful moments devoted at this session to this city's shrines they do not forget the statue of Joseph Leidy in Logan Square.

One other lone and unique figure I would point out to you in the marching column of those associated with this city who represent ideas and forces in the making of the nation under the Constitution. Your imagination may have to stand on tiptoe to see it, for it is that of a little woman in quiet Quaker garb. If emancipation not of blacks alone

but of women has national and world significance—and who would deny it—then Lucretia Mott, by the divine right of her unconquerable spirit and her luminous intellect, walks side by side with Penn and Franklin and Jefferson and Madison down the broad street not of Philadelphia but of mankind—the way toward toleration and liberty and reasoned civic judgment.

I have not made this excursion into the past of Philadelphia just as a reminder to the Philadelphia of the present of the varied men and issues of high adventure with which the city's name was once associated. I have rather had it in mind that the judgments of the day on the one historical event now in the foreground of a series should be relative. If they are, they will more nearly be what history will write dispassionately when it goes behind documents and isolated events and measures the making of a constitution in relation to many things and does it in the temper and by the time schedule that we apply to the Achaean league or the code of Hammurabi.

Perhaps that necessary coolness in appraisal we already have as a heritage from the past history of anniversaries of the Constitution. Apparently the American people as a whole and throughout the constitutional period have taken, except in times of economic-political and regional strife, a somewhat unemotional and detached view of their Constitution. They have never celebrated September 17 as a national holy day in the way in which they have early and continuously observed the natal day of the Declaration of Independence. The historian searches the files of early newspapers in vain for any indication of observance of the date of the adoption of the Constitution. Five days after the ratification by New Hampshire, the ninth state, completing the number necessary to put the Constitution in force, a local celebration was held in Portsmouth, and New York City celebrated on July 23, 1788, the ratification by ten states, the tenth being Virginia. Thereafter any demonstration on the key date is wanting. Year after year the seventeenth of September went unnoticed.

If the first anniversary was not noticed, the same is equally true of others. The laying of the cornerstone of the Capitol on the eighteenth of September, 1792, seemed a double ignoring of the anniversary of the preceding day. Washington chose to date his Farewell Address in 1796 not on the seventeenth day of September but the nineteenth. At the quarter century, national interest was focused on the War of 1812, and one hears only the rumbling of Federalist New England about state rights. And so it goes. On the fiftieth anniversary the nation was in

the throes of the panic of 1837. The guns of Antietam were all the country heard on the seventy-fifth anniversary, although the year before the city of Philadelphia had chosen September 17, 1861, as a proper day for a patriotic rally in support of the Union and the government at Washington. From the seventy-fifth to the hundredth anniversary, if September 17 was observed, it was to dedicate soldiers' cemeteries and monuments, and the Battle of Antietam was the reason, not the completion of the Constitution.

When the centennial of the Constitution came, this Association was two years old and struggling to make its way. The presidential address of that year's meeting in Boston was on the manuscript sources of American history. The program itself did not get nearer the Constitution than the peace negotiations of 1782-83. The attending membership, forty-nine registered, were less conscious of the centennial birthday of a national constitution than they were of the beginning of social functions as a new feature at their meetings. The highlights were a visit to Plymouth in the rain and to Wellesley College where, the secretary records, "Historical specialists sat quietly upon benches along the pleasant shores and contemplated with calm eyes the political economist struggling at the oar upon the tossing waves of Lake Waban."

The centennial of the Constitution, unlike that of the Declaration of Independence, would have passed unnoticed even in Philadelphia if it had not been for the energy of an able member of the Philadelphia bar, Hampton L. Carson. Almost singlehanded he made the city observe September 17, 1887, and published a two-volume account of the preparations and observances. The theme of the leading addresses was apparently the great services of the Supreme Court, which in recent decisions had strengthened the Federal government as against the states. Old attitudes derived from the Civil War were not yet dead, and new issues evident in the efforts of Western states to control emerging national corporate activities were not understood in Philadelphia fifty years ago as they are understood fifty years later.

It will be interesting to see what the record of the current much more prolonged and widespread observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary will be. Into it will enter not alone the orations for the occasion, the clamorous literature of all the super-patriots who are now saving the Constitution anew, the melancholy pessimisms of those who look beyond our borders and proclaim the twilight of democracy and constitutional government, but the deliberations of thoughtful

scholars such as have appeared within the last week here on the programs of two great associations concerned with the study of American history and American political institutions. It might well be the theme of the presidential address fifty years from now to evaluate the literature of this anniversary in an effort to restate the forces and the faith with which the nation of our day faced the latter half of its second century.

So far, then, as the records to date show, the Constitution has had the privilege sought by most of us past forty—that of having our birthdays ignored. Apparently once the government under the Constitution was set on its feet and clothed with the flesh of men in action, we have as a people concentrated upon the goings in and comings out of governments and taken for granted the framework that held them erect. We all have a dim X-ray plate of it in our minds, but the buttons and stays and keyrings added by the rise of political parties and their folkways, the decisions of courts, and the acts of presidents and congresses show up even more plainly than the bones of the Constitution and confuse us. A study of the unwritten and generally accepted amendments to the Constitution would add to our understanding of ourselves and our attitude toward what we call government under a written constitution. We elect presidents by procedures unknown to the Constitution. Congressmen could be no more certain to live in their districts if it were prescribed in the Constitution. The number of those who are hunting for the clause and section that confers powers on the Supreme Court assumed and accepted since Marshall's day and fixes the membership at nine is only exceeded by those who don't look for fear they may not find it. Both groups fill the paying membership of organizations to save the Constitution.

If I seem to have drawn a picture of national indifference to the Constitution throughout the last century and a half, let me be the first to say that such a picture has a false perspective due to emphasis upon celebrations and to prevalent and natural misconceptions of its text. As I have already indicated, the nation has become Constitution-conscious at every major crisis in our national life. Then when the issue was resolved by amendment, court decision, or civil war, it has accepted the survival or expansion as a convincing proof of the wisdom of the founding fathers and the perfection of their work. The turmoil caused by the process of growth and change has left unchanged the popular idea that the Constitution is a static document and that because it is static it is perfect and not a matter for discussion except by legalists.

So far as this universal American faith relates to the survival and the promise of survival of government ordered by the Constitution of 1787, it is the historical guild that has to date furnished a sound historical basis. It has been the task and the scholarly achievement of many in this Association to trace the history of the survival into the twentieth century of a document framed at the close of the eighteenth. Some have pointed out with clarity that the Constitution has survived even when the abolition of suffrage qualifications based on property or race or sex created an electoral democracy unknown, unforeseen, and undesired a century and a half ago. Others have carried forward the story of the nation's territorial expansion from the Appalachians to the Pacific Coast and beyond it to include diverse peoples in distant colonies. The Constitution has been applied and revered in this empire undreamed of by its makers. Larger perhaps than any other historical group is the number who have followed the history of the Constitution through sectional conflicts and civil war and have seen it emerge still the law of a united land. Fewer perhaps are those who have noted what strengths and what weaknesses have been revealed by the development of party organization under a document made by party leaders who foresaw much but not the national development and intensification of the party procedures that had raised them to colonial leadership and to a membership in a Federal constituent assembly. Only a few scholars, and those but a handful since the war between the states, have written the history of the Constitution itself in terms of its interpretations by courts in critical cases. No one, for it is a matter for the future, not of the past, has viewed it in relation to the procedures it established for the conduct of the foreign relations of an isolated and internationally minor state now endowed with enormous power and resources in the midst of a world which it touches at every point of its daily life.

Whatever the story of crisis or strain that your historical work has told, it has left with your readers, the American people, a feeling that the Constitution has survived its major tests and that tracing in the present the forming of new lines of conflict is no major concern of an American historian as teacher or writer. If I dissent from the view that our evolving civilization and its emerging problems are not a proper concern of historians, I do it tonight not so much in the name of history as in behalf of the Constitution and less for the eighteenth century document that faces new strains in the twentieth than in behalf of the experiment in government embodied in it. This experiment has been outlined in many other written documents that either embodied little

or openly avoided much that the American constituent assembly thought essential. Those which imitated it most closely have not survived in other climates, and others which formulated like ideals without similar reservations or distributions of power and functions have served equally well in states imbued with the ideal of democratic self-government. Blind reverence for any document or its authors may end by being the greatest disservice we can inflict on the spirit that should keep it a living thing.

If I express any concern about historical factors in the present scene to whose origin and development historians might address themselves, I do it hesitantly. I do not forget, although I may seem to disregard, all my seminar training in American and German universities. My three predecessors must be conciliated. One said every man was his own historian, another said history was an ethical choice, and the third warned against carrying the present as baggage on excursions into the past. Now I am in a wholly conciliatory mood this evening, and I agree with all three of them. I intend to be my own kind of historian. I shall undoubtedly make choices which I hope are ethical. I shall not etch the features of the present on the tables of the past. I want only with groping hands to trace the features of the present-day America and catch the direction of its gaze and the expression of its countenance.

It is a grave and troubled face that America turns to the future. Youth has gone from it and with it some of the confidence and assurance of youth. There are the evidences of maturity, if not of age. This change has taken place within the generation of many here. Like the maiden who kept the attributes of eternal youth as long as she dwelt in the vale of Shangri La, we find that the America which started at our side to cross the distant mountains has now the features of age, much like the peoples of the Old World who have not been sheltered from the storms of internal revolution and international conflict. What we have known and written of European peoples we dimly apprehend may be some part of what we shall have to learn and write on the next page of our own history. This view is not a function of our own gray hairs. The evidence is undeniable to him who approaches the last fifty years of American history with eyes that range over wider perspectives than American history alone or who views it from angles furnished by newer auxiliary sciences than the traditional ones of palaeography and diplomatics.

The signs of change, the approach of new and different tests for American institutions has been so evident and is so much a concern

of every thoughtful citizen that I do not need to labor the thesis. The men who walked out of Carpenters Hall on September 17, 1787, with a feeling that they had written the final chapter in a political revolution were unaware that science and invention were writing the first chapters in an even mightier revolution of world-wide extent. The hand with which Benjamin Franklin signed a constitution which should fashion the future of a predominantly agricultural and provincial people was one of the hands that turned that people from agriculture to industrialism through applied power, from provincialism to instant communication with the world by the forces he brought from the clouds. The men who had carefully drawn a document of balanced powers and assigned functions launched it, they knew, on troubled waters. But they were quite unconscious of the rising power of new economic interests and tensions stemming from the sciences and inventions that had their birth in those same years. The French revolutionaries sending Lavoisier, the father of chemistry, to the scaffold because he was one of the farmers-general and because their new world had no need of scientists were equally unconscious that they had acted too late and for the wrong reason. They could not foresee that the industrial applications of chemistry were to set up new freedoms and new bondages unlisted in the Declaration of the Rights of Man.

Chance has willed it that while writing this address I have had to turn aside to labors so congenial to the historian, the preparation for publication of some documents that relate to an unknown incident just one hundred and fifty years ago. Those documents cover a controversy in 1787 between the greatest English industrialist of his day, Matthew Boulton, and a Prussian director of mines in the Ruhr. The young Prussian official, Baron Stein, was in charge of the Westphalian mines and manufactures in the enlightened despotism of Frederick the Great. This young bureaucrat had heard of the great advances in industry and mining made in England and of the perfection of fire machines to make possible deep pit mining. German coal and iron and the resources of the state would profit by all he could learn or filch of the products of the Soho foundry of Boulton and Watt. He lived to learn in mortification that even in 1787 England was guarding her industrial pre-eminence by private watchfulness and public laws. Germany had to wait for other days and the development of her own science to challenge England in a rivalry here foreshadowed in 1787 and ultimately developing between all Western nations on a world-wide scale as the dominant characteristic of our age. The end—or is it the begin-

ning?—swept the American nation, founded in 1787, into the full tide of controversies from which its makers had thought to set it free.

This minor incident in industrial rivalry between faraway nations in 1787 is an unsought symbol of the forces and conflicts that have developed with giant strides side by side with the Constitution formed in the same year for a nonindustrial group of thirteen states. Their citizens, liberated from monarchy and old-world control, have multiplied many-fold and conquered a continental domain. But the black banner of smoke that streamed in 1787 from Soho floats in the sky of every nation, and the factory whistle marshals and dismisses the mujiks of Russia and the citizens of Boston and Philadelphia more imperatively than any sovereign's command. The labors of Washington and Madison in Philadelphia have yet to be tested by the fires lighted in the foundries of Boulton and Watt in Soho, in the laboratories of Priestley and Lavoisier, and brought from the sky by Benjamin Franklin.

My concern tonight, as you perceive, is with the historian's approach to the writing of the American history of the next half century and to such reviews as are necessary of the background of the last century and a half. I have made it an incidental task each year in recent years to scan from thirty to fifty of the most widely read volumes in American history, and as a historian I am not happy about their breadth or competence or popularity. They are too often unbalanced, and therefore unhistorical, semi-sensational journalistic exploitations of the worst features of incidents and individuals that could nowhere have had such exaggerated development as in a land where eighteenth century individualism and protracted pioneering attitudes have been projected through a century and a half into a twentieth century industrialism which interlocks the interests and welfare of all classes and all nations. The sole merit of such works is that their writers and their readers are aware in a dim and distorted fashion that there are in American life and history unchronicled forces and problems that cannot be exorcised by teachers' oaths or new alien and sedition laws or mass or class panaceas or lip service to the Constitution.

I am content if those who have listened thus far sum it all up as a gloss on Sir Gilbert Murray's dictum that "a society without history cannot understand what it is doing". If I seem more than objectively interested in the chronological parallelism and historical interrelations of two movements for which 1787 may be used as a symbol, it may be in part because of another event in Philadelphia in 1787. The legacy of the dying Congress of the Confederation was the ordinance for the

government of the Northwest Territory. Into that area thus organized and ultimately extended have flowed, sometimes in parallel streams and sometimes in successive waves, all the forces and races and issues that have come to fill the foreground of the American scene in 1937. Here, if anywhere in the seamless web of history, one can trace the strands that form the present and will appear in the future pattern of America. They are plainly visible in every state of the old Northwest of 1787. They are vivid and unmistakable in the new Northwest. Within the state I know best I seem to dwell on the boundaries of advancing industrialized America and retreating agricultural individualism. The great river visible to me each day runs even now in its short course from its source to my own threshold the gamut of American history from virgin forest and Indian settlements, past farms and factories worked by every major immigrant stock, past mills and educational institutions founded by pioneers from New England and the East, past a city whose streets have been reddened by industrial warfare. That river and that Northwest area outlined in 1787 have held the nation together in every major crisis under the Constitution. I sometimes wonder whether it is not now a visible symbol of the boundary between an old America in the newest area and a new America in the oldest area, whether the river of union is to become a river of division.

And yet it is all strangely confused, for that same river, a few miles below where I see it, flows over a dam built in the decade of rugged individualism by contributions from every citizen in the nation but furnishing power to a factory directed by the outstanding exponent of Adam Smith's "obvious and simple system of natural liberty" by the limitation of government in relation to business and industry. But fancy yields to one unchanging conviction that we shall proceed more intelligently and more confidently as a people to the resolution of the old with the new in America if history gives us the longer perspective and the detached appraisal necessary to the understanding of what we are and what we are doing.

How shall the historian of America achieve that detachment, that necessary aloofness, that elevation which will give him the larger perspective and a sound discrimination between the passing and the permanent? To finish the quotation from Gilbert Murray, How may he embody that scholarship without which history cannot understand itself? In an earlier paragraph I approached and then retired from the question. Let me suggest two answers that will perhaps be anticipated by those who recall that I once was chiefly interested in European

history and that I have been since its foundation one of your representatives on the Social Science Research Council.

It was said long ago that the study of history gives you a feeling akin to that of having taken a journey in a far country. You come back to see the familiar with new eyes and to measure the old with a sense of proportion unknown before you were detached from it. If the stairs are not so steep nor the rooms so large in the revisited home of your childhood, the home itself takes on new and larger meanings. The realities are not after all the physical things you left behind but the memories and ideals you have carried with you. To the American historian, then, I would say, Go away from home that you may know what home really is. Do it by travel or study or both. If by study, then how far away? Not too far but far enough to convince you that history is the record of change even before the age of science and discovery. I should not want to be understood as recommending intensification in ancient history as a preparation for American history under the Constitution, because I have an uneasy feeling that you might always be dissolving Achaean leagues and reproducing the fall of Rome.

If history has any lessons to teach, the supreme one is that of ceaseless change within human society and in mankind's relation to his physical environment. As a nation our generation doesn't need Spengler or his like to teach us this. The World War and its aftermath, the publicity given the buried and forgotten civilization of Tutankamen, and the chastening years since October, 1929, have been more than sufficient evidence of the insecurity of past and present security. I am interested in a fearless historical assessment of the factors and forces that have made us as a nation something we were not in 1787.

Fortunately the American historian dealing with the constitutional period does not need to go back to ancient times, suggestive as such studies of vanished societies may be. He has an opportunity to see how other peoples in the same century and a half have adapted themselves to the changes made inevitable by scientific, industrial, and economic forces that have played with even greater intensity upon them than on us since the eighteenth century. Fortunately also for the American historian the adjustment in most of the Western European nations since 1787 has been so much more rapid than ours that it gives him a perspective of thirty to fifty years of realized history from which to view movements and forces that have come into our national consciousness only in the last decade. For these reasons some familiarity

with modern Europe in the period since 1787 gives the American historian a vantage point from which to distinguish the significant and the ephemeral as they show themselves in the American scene.

Nobody, I hope, thinks that I make this suggestion with the idea that what has happened in Western Europe under the impact of the industrial revolution will repeat itself unchanged upon American soil. If that were the answer, then the things that have happened in Europe should also be past history with us. No, America is different. It is still much nearer the eighteenth century in its outlook and social philosophy than any of the countries in which the doctrines of laissez-faire and natural rights were formulated. This is not a reproach. It is simply an observation, which I think could be copiously documented, and it is made in this instance by one who lived the earlier part of his life in the eighteenth century. That interesting experience was made possible by being born in the Middle West, where the new colonists and virgin soil prevailed and where reading surreptitiously extracts from Voltaire and Bob Ingersoll provided the only available intellectual asbestos against the hell fires of an annual winter Wesleyan revival; by studying Paley's *Natural Theology* and Butler's *Analogy* and Adam Smith and then escaping to learn the rudiments of scholarship by the first use of sources to write two undergraduate papers for Frederick Jackson Turner on Sectionalism in the Constitutional Convention and on Jefferson's Economic Opinions. Is it strange, then, that an American thus grounded and later diverted into modern European history by a passing interest in German social legislation of the early 1880's should commend to American historians the study of Europe since 1787? Does not such an intellectual lineage document an American's appreciation of the likenesses and differences between the two continents? Is it not a basis for understanding those European observers who fear we may be hastened unprepared and impotent into long delayed political and social readjustments with the resultant conflicts that create dangers for our inherited ideal of constitutional government by laws, not men?

Any alertness to possible parallels between American and European history in the constitutional period must be tempered, as I have just suggested, by an equal awareness of the differences between the European and the American social and political milieu. I venture to recall some obvious differences.

The European revolutionary thought of the eighteenth century rediscovered the individual outside the inherited medieval privileged class strata. It discovered him in a new class, it is true, but in seeking

to make a place for the bourgeois it formulated a philosophy of individualism that challenged the existing political and social structure, which itself had a philosophy exemplified for centuries in church and state and etched deep by historic social prestige symbols. It is all too easy to illustrate in church or state how callous and indifferent the *ancien régime* was in its insistence on its privileges, but it never lost entirely its consciousness of noblesse oblige, it never wholly accepted the idea that wealth gives and justifies power over other men, and its social prestige remained long after the so-called realities of power had passed to the masters of capital and industry. At every point the old social order, though chastened, was there to challenge the new and to bid for the support of the new underprivileged victims of industrialism and of a peasantry loyal through centuries to land and the church.

The very violence of the opening of the European struggle against class privilege too long insisted on was a lesson in the value of caution and compromise. The succeeding century—from 1814 to 1914—never let the class conflict reach that pitch again. The privileged classes walked "reluctantly backward into the future lest a worse thing should befall them"—but they walked. Their class coherence enabled them to oppose an alternate philosophy of social action to the ruthless exploitation by industrialism, individual and corporate, in the name of the new freedom. If you choose to interpret this last century in Europe as a series of class conflicts, it must be obvious that in the democratic countries the conflicts were of political philosophies and platforms pledged alike to the common welfare but differing enough in method so that the electorate might intelligently divide and yet their representatives ultimately unite on some acceptable steps, long or short, toward a common goal.

In Europe individualism and laissez-faire seem extraneous and of the surface even in the eighteenth century, whereas in America then and since they have been indigenous and planted so deeply in a frontier people that they are rooted in emotion. What was a revolution in Europe both in thought and in the balance of power between classes was to contemporary colonial America but a simple statement of self-evident truths about individual freedom and a government that served best by governing least. More than a century of pioneer history in a land of seemingly inexhaustible resources consecrated the political philosophy with which we began as a nation. It was and is a noble heritage. It shed a kindly light upon the deeds of the frontiersman, the merchant adventurer, the thousands of little entrepreneurs setting

up factories and mills and banks. It lent an equal aura to those who by ways that seemed good to them crushed their competitors or gained control of national resources or stationed themselves at the crossroads of commerce to take undue toll from farmer, laborer, and the consuming but complacent public. Such swollen exemplars of individualism sapped the substance out of a national ideal. Like the privileged classes in the *ancien régime* who hastened revolution by defying and weakening the power of the monarchy, they have often corrupted and brought into contempt the government and the legal system which was made to protect them and mediate their just rights. They have been unconscious of a changing mood in the nation, apparent since 1870 and increased sharply since the turn of the century. Now, since the World War, their fear and their lack of a social philosophy defensible in the forum of public opinion leave them little but a vituperative vocabulary and a blind and dangerous insistence that any change or social adjustment is revolution. They would imperil all loyalty to government and the Constitution by using them as defenses for their individual or group acquisitiveness. They give little evidence of realizing that, at the close of a century and a half under the same Constitution and under the dynamics of an industrial civilization ruled by science and machinery, we are passing, as President Hoover pointed out, "from a period of extremely individualistic action into a period of associational activities".

The sentence just quoted from the former President is the essence of what I have to suggest as the task of the historian of America in the present and in the immediate future, namely, that of tracing this evolution from the extreme individualism typical of our national thought and polity since the eighteenth century to the growing social awareness that it must yield in large areas to common action for the general welfare. I might add that for the historian the best introduction to this task is the two volumes on Social Trends prepared by the commission appointed by President Hoover.

Whatever the first step may be in any attempt by American historians to reassess the forces that in a century and a half have brought us face to face with the problems of older civilizations, the result, if successful, will come only because history reclaims its proper place as the most trustworthy guide to the study and interpretation of human conduct. It was once such an epitome, such a synthesis of all that men knew of mankind and of human conduct. The complexities of modern civilization, the multiplicity of the factors introduced by the dynamics

of science and invention, the new light shed upon man's nature by anthropology and psychology, the varied activities of men in groups in a technological age have produced new disciplines and techniques. They were needed, and they have achieved significant results in their study of particular angles of human conduct or of the social and physical factors conditioning it. The historian can and must avail himself of their results in treating the history of any modern nation.

Awareness of what is being done in the other social sciences is a special obligation of him who would write the history of American democracy under a constitution conceived and adopted by an essentially aggressive pioneering people on the eve of an age of science and technology that has carried us farther from them than they were from the Greeks and Romans. How this change has come about is written more plainly and logically in a land where supposedly inexhaustible natural resources set no bounds to individual initiative and exploitation. It is a story that cannot be told in terms of political history. That idea fortunately was abandoned a generation ago. But we have not yet learned in writing American history—local, state, and national—how to co-operate with the newer social sciences and utilize fully the results of their studies. Human conduct, whether individual or group, is so complex and varied that history, when it attempts to describe it, cannot afford to overlook any of its manifestations, whether recorded in statistics, economics, political science, sociology, ethnology, anthropology, or psychology.

If I began this address by localizing here in Philadelphia the beginnings one hundred and fifty years ago of American government under the Constitution and the Ordinance of 1787 and of the age of science and invention which has played upon them and upon all societies since 1787, if I drew upon my own experience and studies almost immodestly, it was to the one purpose of raising for historians of America the problems that are in the mind of every thinking American. Is it not timely to ask what history can contribute to his better understanding of the historical factors that will condition the survival of the experiment begun so anxiously in this city? If the task seems a difficult one, there is nevertheless encouragement for those who undertake it. The history of Western Europe furnishes some parallels in the same period under the same transforming forces, and it differs widely enough to leave the history of America with the challenge of uniqueness. In his task the American historian has the data and matured techniques of his fellow students of the American

scene in the disciplines known as social sciences and in turn can more than repay his debt by a cool, time-conditioned, genetic synthesis that gives their own work its true significance.

In conclusion let me recall that the opening references to past constitutional celebrations and to the untrammeled discussions of the last week give indication that the historian in America still has preserved to him the liberty of discussion which is as vital to the preservation of democracy as it is to the promotion of scholarship. It would indeed be a tragedy if under the guise of commemorating a great experiment in self-government, dependent on enlightenment by scholarship, forces or factions inimical to both should seek to throttle the one under the pretext of preserving the other. Historical scholarship without freedom to speak the truth about our national history would become here, as it has in many lands, a mute testimonial of the decay of all scholarship and all liberty. The freedom granted the historian to write or rewrite American history under the Constitution and under the coincident influences of science and technology will be a test not of the people's knowledge of the text of a document but of their understanding of the liberties it guarantees. It will be their answer to the question raised on Pennsylvania soil seventy-five years ago, "whether a nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure".

GUY STANTON FORD.

The University of Minnesota.

THE PTOLEMIES AND THE WELFARE OF THEIR SUBJECTS

In respect to the Ptolemaic dynasty and its three hundred years of rule over Egypt two quite divergent judgments are becoming discernible among the papyrologists and the historians who use the information which the papyri supply.[1] One group of scholars, representing the dominant trend of today, maintains that the Egyptian natives were bitterly oppressed during this long period. They assert, correctly, that the Ptolemaic god-king was in theory absolute in his rule and that he had no other interest in the hard-working Egyptian people than to see that they filled the granaries and the banks of the royal *oikos*. The wealth produced by the ill-rewarded labors of the native population, according to this group, was employed solely in the interests of the rulers.[2] The chief object of their ambition was to play an

[1] This paper was read in the absence of the writer before the Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, held at Oxford, August 30-September 3, 1937. The system of abbreviations customarily employed by ancient historians in referring to the inscriptions, to the Greek papyri, and to the technical journals has been retained in the notes. These abbreviations are: Arch. f. Pap.—*Archiv für Papyrusforschung;* BGU—*Aegyptische Urkunden aus den koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden* (Berlin, 1892-1937); P. Bouriant—Paul Collart, *Les Papyrus Bouriant* (Paris, 1926); P. Col.—*Columbia Papyri: Greek Series* (New York, 1929-1934); P. Ent.—Octave Guéraud, ΕΝΤΕΥΞΕΙΣ (Cairo, 1931); P. Lond.—F. G. Kenyon and others, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum* (London, 1893-1917); OGI—W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae* (Leipzig, 1903-1905); P. Mich. I—C. C. Edgar, *Michigan Papyri I: Zenon Papyri* (Ann Arbor, 1931); PCZ—*Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du musée du Caire,* C. C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri* (Cairo, 1925-1931); PER—*Papyri Erzherzog Rainer* (collection in Vienna); PSI—G. Vitelli, *Pubblicazioni della Società italiana, Papiri Greci e Latini* (Florence, 1912-1935); P. Strass.—Friedrich Preisigke, *Griechische Papyrus der kaiserlichen Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg* (Leipzig, 1912); P. Teb.—B. P. Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly, *Tebtunis Papyri* (New York, 1902, 1907, 1933); UPZ—Ulrich Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit:* I, *Papyri aus Unterägypten* (Berlin, 1927).

[2] This is the view presented by Victor Martin, *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung,* XIX (1934), 102; W. Peremans, "Ptolemée II Philadelphe", in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire,* XII (1933), 1006; and W. W. Tarn, "Ptolemy II", in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology,* XIV (1928), 259. *Cf.* Tarn's statement on p. 260 that there is no evidence to show that the acknowledged prosperity of the bureaucratic class extended down to the natives and that we know of nothing which was done for them. See also his *Hellenistic Civilization,* 1st ed. (London, 1927), p. 164 (repeated in 2d ed., p. 180): "They did not help their subjects . . . their government, ethically considered, stood well below that of the other two Macedonian dynasties."

important role in Mediterranean politics.[3] Some of the proponents of this view assert, as if in condemnation, that the Ptolemies as rulers made no provision for the education of the Egyptians; that no legislation was passed in the interest of public health which affected them; and that the oppressed Egyptians seldom even demanded redress against the injustices heaped upon them. Connected with this view is an explanation of the privileged position accorded to the Greeks and other aliens who streamed into the Arsinoite nome in the time of Philadelphus.[4] They became the overseers of the work done by Egyptian manual labor. In the third century only aliens—Greeks for the most part—were enlisted in the land army, which supported the throne. This is all to be accepted. The "Hellenes" formed, it is true, a preferred class with definite advantages which enabled them to exploit the natives in the ultimate interest of the king-god.

A second and smaller group, starting with the same basic material and agreeing in most of the fundamentals, comes nevertheless to a different conclusion regarding the treatment of the Egyptians and the direction and results of Ptolemaic legislation as these may be estimated in terms of well-being of the indigenes. Its judgment is by no means a paean of praise, but it considers more strongly the economic and social factors fixed in the situation when Ptolemy I Soter took

[3] This view has behind it the initial and powerful authority of Ulrich Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Grundzüge* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 4. For the reigns of Ptolemies II and III it does apply. The far-reaching ambitions of the Ptolemies advanced by Peremans, *Rev. belge de philol. et d'hist.*, XII, 1006, are scarcely credible. Peremans has, I think, misunderstood Polybius, V, 34, which he quotes in support of his view. In Polybius's mind the predominance of interest of the first three Ptolemies in the external possessions of Egypt over that displayed in their internal government was an element in a defensive policy. *Because of* their control of Coele-Syria and Cyprus and their possessions in the islands, in Asia Minor, and about the Hellespont they were never in distress about their rule in Egypt. "For this reason, naturally, they paid great attention to external affairs": **διὸ καὶ τὴν σπομδὴν εἰκότως ἐποιοῦντο περὶ τῶν ἔξω πραγμάτων**. Into this essentially defensive policy Peremans has read an offensive and imperialist purpose. *Cf.* Tarn's statement of the problem of offensive or defensive policy in Ptolemaic foreign affairs as stated in *Journ. Egypt. Arch.*, XIV (1928), 250-51. Tarn qualifies the meaning of Polybius, upon whom his discussion obviously rests, much more strongly than I would do. He is right, in my judgment, in emphasizing the aggressiveness of the Ptolemaic trade policy in comparison with its political policy. The method of address to a reigning Ptolemy by a petitioner in PSI V 541—"you who rule the inhabited parts of the earth", *i.e.*, the Mediterranean world—has no relation, of course, to fact or hope. It is merely an adulatory phrase.

[4] Some of them came with letters of introduction and recommendation to Zenon, dispenser of jobs in that new and growing organization to which was assigned the task of making the "gift estate" of Apollonius productive and profitable. Instances of these letters of introduction are: P. Mich. I 6; P. Col. III 7, 4 (Westermann and Hasenoehrl, *Zenon Papyri*); PSI IV 376. *Cf.* PCZ III 59447, 1.

over the control of Egypt, first as satrap, later as king.[5] It weighs more judicially the environmental factors concerned and the interplay of external and internal politics upon the social attitude of the state. Thus it arrives at a more balanced and more favorable judgment upon the legislation emanating from the bureaus of Ptolemy I and his successors and the ideas which inspired them as rulers.

The privileged position held by aliens, chiefly Greeks, in the army and the civil service of the early Ptolemies has been regarded as proof of Greek nationalistic sentiments held by the rulers themselves and adopted by their foreign soldiers and the agents of their civil authority. These "Hellenes", it is claimed, regarded themselves as conquerors ruling over a conquered people.[6] The first serious break in this "nationalistic" theory was made by Elias Bickermann when he proved that the class privileges established by the Ptolemies were basically economic and determined by services rendered to the state in definite callings, such as that of soldier, priest, royal peasant, or the like.[7] Differences in privileged position based upon population classes did

[5] Notably this is the case with Pierre Jouguet. See his "L'Égypte ptolémaïque" in Gabriel Hanotaux, *Histoire de la nation égyptienne*, III, 31-42. These pages were reproduced by Jouguet and supported by notes and references in *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale*, XXX (1930), 513-36. See also Jouguet's discussion of papyrology and its relation to the political history of Egypt in *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung*, XIX (1934), 62-101. He concedes that the profits must have been enormous which the Ptolemaic state obtained from the country by its strict control of resources and production and its energetic exploitation of the capacity for work always characteristic of the Egyptians. He acknowledges, also, that these profits were used for the advantage of the state, incarnated in the person of the divine ruler (p. 91). He regards the natives, however, as "almost enslaved". The same direction toward a more sympathetic understanding of the regime of the Ptolemaic dynasty is apparent in Wilhelm Schubart's study, "Verfassung und Verwaltung des Ptolemäerreichs", in *Der alte Orient*, XXXV, no. 4 (1937). His conclusions upon pp. 38-39 should be noted particularly.

[6] Ernst Kornemann in *Raccolta Lumbroso* (Milan, 1925), pp. 235-45, gives a drastic expression of this point of view. Even in M. I. Rostovtzeff's balanced study, "Ptolemaic Egypt", in *Cambridge Ancient History*, VII, 149-54, something of this attitude appears. Note the phrase "servants of foreigners", p. 153, and "the atmosphere of bitter hostility between the unequal parts of the population", p. 154.

[7] See his article, "Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte", in Arch. f. Pap., VIII (1927), 238-39. The privileges granted to victors in the games may best be explained on the theory of conspicuous glory reflected upon the rulers by the athletic prowess of their subjects. They are certainly not racial in their motivation. Bickermann's view against the nationalistic motivations of the Ptolemies is accepted as the basis for Mlle. Claire Préaux's acute study, "Politique du race ou politique royale" in *Chronique d'Égypte*, XI (1936), 111-38. She suggests, in substitution for the idea of Hellenic "nationalism", that the Ptolemies followed a doctrine of the predominant interest of the crown, that is, "a royal policy". Against her substitution it may be said that any kingly power follows a "royal policy", as a matter of course.

exist, but their explanation is not to be sought along the lines of race cleavage and racial hatreds.[8]

We may take the petitions from Ghoran, published by Guéraud, as fairly representative of the type of petty injustices and causes of complaint which would normally arise in any similar village of Egypt at that time. Even a cursory examination of these will show that the theory of national hatreds does not hold. "Hellenes", "Macedonians", and "Persians of the Succession" as often committed assault or robbery or inflicted other forms of injury upon persons of their own class or racial name as they did upon Egyptians.[9] Egyptians by name did all of these things to other Egyptians as well as to men of Greek name.[10] And men who bear Hellenic names frequently appear together with persons of Egyptian name on the same side, as plaintiffs or accused, in cases involving petty complaints.[11] Furthermore it is a notable fact that attacks upon the shrines and temples of the native gods and their inhabitants customarily came from persons of Egyptian name or from Greco-Egyptian half-breeds.[12] The explanation of these events by the

[8] See the statement of Octave Guéraud, P. Ent., in the note to no. 86, lines 9-10, that manifestations of national hostility are exceptional both in the Magdola petitions and in general in the documents of the third century B.C. Guéraud explains the lack of such signs by the suggestion that the relative positions of the two elements, of superiority for the Greeks, inferiority for the natives, was accepted and fully acceded to by both sides.

[9] In this examination of the *enteuxeis* the assumption has been made that Greek and Egyptian names were, at that time, sufficient proof of national affiliation. Greeks, together with "Macedonians" and "Persians of the Epigone" appearing in cases involving the same nationals (as judged by name): P. Ent., nos. 4, 20, 38 (banker of Greek name *vs.* a donkey driver of Greek name), 40 (Aischrion, son of Horos, presumably a half-breed), 49, 66, 69, 78 (accuser, a water carrier of Greek name), 81, 84, 87, 88, 89. Greeks, Macedonians, and Persians *vs.* Egyptians by name: *ibid.*, nos. 21, 35, 44, 60, 70, 72, 73, 75, 111.

[10] Egyptians by name *vs.* Egyptians: *ibid.*, nos. 24, 47, 50, 65.

[11] *Ibid.*, nos. 43, 80, 91.

[12] *Ibid.*, no. 80, of 221 B.C., tells of an assault upon an Isis shrine; *cf.* UPZ I 5 and 6, of 163 B.C.; P. Lond. I 44 (pp. 33-34) of 161 B.C.; P. Strass. 91; P. Teb. III 1, 781 is connected with the native revolt of Dionysius-Petosarapis. See lines 7-8: 'when the Egyptian rebels had attacked it". The priests, in this case "overseers" of the temple, are generally regarded as the "great rallying point of national sentiment". H. I. Bell, "Hellenic Culture in Egypt", *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, VIII (1922), 143. Yet here they are compelled to appeal, against attacks by Egyptians, to the police. In this instance there is something wrong with the idea of a militant Egyptian nationalism led by the priesthood. In P. Ent. 86 a case is recorded in which Egyptian housebuilders were intimidated by a man of Greek name from giving testimony in favor of an Egyptian woman. The case, on closer inspection, loses all point as an argument for fear inspired in these lowly Egyptians, through racial privilege, so that they dared not give evidence against a Greek. For, a hundred-aroura holder of "Hellenic" status, bearing a non-Egyptian name (Biou.as) was, in the same way, frightened off by threats of violence.

theory of racial hatred, especially as evidences of anti-Hellenic feeling on the part of the native Egyptian population, does not meet the test of close scrutiny in the presence of the new information which has been granted us.

There is, as a matter of fact, some evidence which indicates that the dislike of "strangers" in the villages along the Nile was directed more sharply against newcomers from other nomes of Egypt than against aliens from the outside world.[13] Study of the Zenon papyri of the middle of the third century B. C. suggests as a substitute for the theory of a nationalistic and anti-alien basis for any hatred which existed against the upper classes the explanation of a natural envy against a dominant class engendered in an underprivileged part of the population. Economic rewards and the social advantages which accompanied these were granted by the government according to the relative ability of its agents to serve the needs of the administration. In the third century B. C. immigrants of Greek training, usually from areas of dominant Hellenic culture, had the requisite training and aptitude, which was "modern" for that time, to meet the needs and purposes of the early Ptolemaic regime. They furnished the men best equipped with the technical knowledge or with the power of business organization which the kings had to have.[14] For that reason they were preferred. They reacted toward the natives, whose work they guided, as any people of superior and expanding culture will always act toward a people whom they direct—with a conscious and obnoxious superiority.[15]

The problem of whether the Ptolemaic legislation, as far as it is known to us, shows a real concern for the welfare of the indigenes is necessarily associated with that of the long series of disturbances and rebellions of the Egyptians which are symptomatic of the internal history of Egypt and recur from time to time, beginning shortly after

[13] P. Ent. 79, 9-10. The complainant, who had been grievously insulted rather than physically mishandled, was of "Hellenic" status and a *xenos*, "stranger", meaning a man who had come in from another Egyptian nome. In P. Ent. 83 an Egyptian woman, recently come from the Heracleopolite nome to reside at Oxyryncha in the Arsinoite, claims to have been beaten because she was a *xene* (a "stranger").

[14] For the technical superiorities brought into Egypt by the Greek immigrants, see Westermann, "The Greek Exploitation of Egypt", *Political Science Quarterly*, XL (1925), 517-39.

[15] This attitude was quite apparent in the time of Ptolemy II. In an unpublished Columbia document (P. Col. Inv. 274) a man who may be an Arab (name indistinguishable) complained to Zenon that he had been scorned by Krotos in Syria, and later by Jason in the Fayum, "because I am a βάρβαρος", and again in lines 18-21, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι ἑλληνίζειν, "because I do not speak a good Greek".

the battle of Raphia in 217 B.C. and breaking out intermittently throughout the course of the second century B.C. Although we have very little information about them, the explanation generally given is that these struggles were nationalistic—Egyptian in their origin, that is, native revolts against a hated foreign oppressor.[16] It is true that in the revolt of Dionysius-Petosarapis in 165 B.C. latent national longings of the Egyptians seem to have been awakened which had long lain dormant in the traditions of the priesthood of the old religion.[17] Also in isolated prophecies of the Egyptian priests of the second century B.C. ancient Pharaonic hopes for the appearance of a messianic deliverer find a belated reappearance. But these have been explained as academic revivals among the learned men of the temples rather than as the expression of an active feeling which emanated from and moved the masses of the native population.[18]

The explanation of these revolts as an outcome of a "nationalistic" spirit, however that may be defined for the Egypt ruled by the Lagid dynasty, has had its influence in giving rise to the preconception that the royal decrees issued at that period and the actions of the higher Greek officials show little concern for the welfare of the Egyptian masses. This theory should, in my judgment, be set aside, and Ptolemaic legislation should be reconsidered without this prejudice arising from a doubtful hypothesis as to the causes of the internal disturbances. In the attempt to find other motivating tendencies behind

[16] For a bibliography of the revolts see Jouguet in *Münchener Beiträge*, XIX, 93, n. 113. Jouguet himself, one of the most competent of our living scholars in this field, has undergone a gradual transformation in his understanding of the second century revolts. In his article, "Le roi nubien Hergonaphor et les révoltes de la Thébaide", in *Mélanges Octave Navarre* (Toulouse, 1935), pp. 270-71, he speaks of the "sentiment national des indigenes"; and in the *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, II (1923), 436, he states that the Egyptian priesthood was united with the (Egyptian) warriors in a common feeling of hatred against the Macedonian dynasty. In his most recent study upon Ptolemy Philometor and the Sixth Syrian War, in *Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, LXIII (1937), 200-18, the question of nationalism, in the sense of anti-Greek sentiment, is completely subordinated in a more penetrating analysis which correctly distinguishes the mutinous outbreaks in Alexandria from the disturbances in the Egyptian countryside. In her elaborate discussion of the Egyptian revolutions under the Ptolemaic dynasty in *Chronique d'Égypte*, XI (1936), 522-52, Mlle. Préaux points out that the native Egyptians could be found upon both sides, fighting with the native leaders against the dynasty, or for the dynasty against the native leaders. Egyptian nationalism, expressing itself in anti-Hellenic feeling, plays little part in her analysis as a fundamental cause of the revolts. See p. 552.

[17] See Wilcken, *Papyruskunde, Grundzüge*, p. 22, and *Chrestomathie*, no. 9, p. 16; also UPZ I pp. 107, 479, and P. Teb. III 1, 781.

[18] H. R. Hall, "Egypt to the Coming of Alexander", *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, VI, 157.

the Ptolemaic decrees and method of rule the problem might best be stated in these terms: To what extent did the dynasty itself and its functionaries identify their own interests with the welfare of the total number of their Egyptian subjects? [19] In view of the small amount of our available data, a comparative method should be followed in the attempt to ascertain the aims of the dynasty as expressed in the decrees and administrative enactments now before us. Comparative studies should bring into contrast Hellenistic legislation in other areas which were then under Greek domination. Especially, similar enactments and institutions in Egypt under the rule of Rome should be carefully investigated.[20] Also, the "institutional" approach must be broadened so as to include all the means of expression by collective action which were available to the Egyptian natives.[21] Especially, the revolts themselves should be approached with the possibility in mind that they too represent a method of reaction against the central government when misgovernment under bad rulers or bad advisers impelled the administration itself toward measures of oppressive exploitation.

Foremost among the old Egyptian institutions which limited the theoretical absolutism of the Ptolemies was the right conceded to the natives by the government of *anachoresis* (the "going up" to the temple) and *ekchoresis* (the "going out", presumably from the nome). The first is connected with right of asylum, which was bestowed by the Ptolemies so liberally, on the whole, upon the temples of the native gods.[22] In the second and first centuries B.C. such grants of asylum were particularly frequent. Important in the consideration of the Ptolemaic ruling attitude is the nonnational, or perhaps supernational,

[19] Future investigation of this question must determine what is meant by "the theoretical absolutism" of the Ptolemies. The constant emphasis upon the "theory" implies that their sovereignty was, in practice, limited by so many recognized institutions that, even in its treatment of the native Egyptians, it was not an absolutism, much less a despotism.

[20] The comparative method should also include the Pharaonic legislation and attitude and the traditional institutions of ancient Egypt, particularly those of the Saite period, and the changes and survivals under Persian rule. Limitations of knowledge and linguistic equipment make this broader inquiry impossible for me to pursue.

[21] See John R. Commons, *Institutional Economics* (New York, 1934), p. 69: "We may define an institution as Collective Action, in control of Individual Action." Thorstein Veblen's definition in his *Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York, 1899), p. 190, is still broader: "Institutions are, in substance, prevalent habits of thought with respect to particular relations and particular functions of the individual and the community."

[22] G. Lefèbvre, "ΙΕΡΑ ΑΣΥΛΑ du Fayum", *Annales du service des antiquités*, XIX, 37 ff.; Friedr. von Woess, *Asylwesen Aegyptens* (Munich, 1923), pp. 47-55.

character of this right. There is only one known restriction upon it which can possibly be explained as arising from racial or nationalistic conceptions or from differences in creed.[23]

In the Ptolemaic period the "going up" (*anachoresis*) appears as a group protest against some threatened or actual injustice of administrative officials or private employers.[24] The *ekchoresis* was a walkout of workers from their *idia,* their "own place", into another nome. This, too, is combined with refusal to work. For our purpose the important point is the vital change in the meaning of *anachoresis* which occurred in the first century of Roman rule. In its manifestations in Egypt of the Ptolemies it represents a concerted action of a unified local group. As far as the extant examples of its occurrence indicate the result attained, it was more often than not demonstrably successful in gaining its purpose. Under Rome it became an individualized effort to escape fiscal oppression. No matter how many persons fled from a village, the act was an individual counsel of despair. Each man simply left his *idia* without hope or expectation of redress of his grievances and without apparent hope or desire of return. The tax

[23] Woess, pp. 60-72. The "Persians of the Succession" formed the class which was refused this right.

[24] In BGU VIII 1797 (late Ptolemaic) an individual recourse to this method of protest does occur. The translation of *anachoresis* as "strike" is misleading through its unavoidable modern connotations. It was, in effect, merely a walkout and work boycott by a local group. Four typical examples of this form of group action may here be cited from the period of Ptolemaic rule:

PSI V 502, 8 ff. (257-256 B.C.). This reports an actual resort to temple refuge by peasants on the estate of Apollonius and threat of abandoning all work on producing a crop. It is important to note that this threat brought results even when used against the dioecetes, the all-powerful treasurer general of Egypt.

P. Teb. III 1, 707 (118 B.C.). The royal peasants of Tebtunis refuse to carry on the irrigation work because of some judicial action carried out in violation of provisions laid down by the government. The *fellahin* merely withdrew from their village (ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκεχωρηκέναι), without recourse to temple protection.

BGU VIII 1815 (61-60 B.C.). The corporation of the royal peasants of Machor resorted to the work boycott in collective protest against some threatened action of the officials. Their head man formulated and presented to the strategus a petition for redress.

BGU VIII 1762 (probably 58 B.C.). A group appeared before the door of the strategus, calling upon the name of the queen and upon the troops (representing the government, according to Bickermann) for redress of wrongs committed by one Hermaiscus. They threatened complete cessation of all their activities, including government and private work, unless Hermaiscus and his crowd were compelled to leave the nome.

Cf. P. Teb. III 1, 791, *ca.* 116 B.C., a collective complaint of the royal peasants, without threat of cessation of work, so far as the fragmentary document shows. Schubart shows a fine understanding of the value of the work boycott by the peasants (*Der alte Orient,* XXXV, no. 4, pp. 23-25).

deficiency which resulted from these disappearances was shifted to the shoulders of those more enduring villagers who remained.[25]

Related to the *anachoresis* and *ekchoresis* is another concession granted chiefly to the agricultural population of Egypt, the purpose of which was to restore to individual royal peasants or to others who were working for the government their freedom of movement and activity at periods crucial to their economic value to the state. This was a release from arrest and assurance of freedom from molestation for a given period, either thirty or sixty days. It was granted in the form of a letter of safe-conduct.[26] From the instances thus far published it must be acknowledged that the purpose of the institution was purely economic and utilitarian, designed and carried out solely in the interest of the revenues of the state.[27] Nevertheless this concession to practicability was as valid and as useful to the peasants and to the state as if it had been motivated solely by the loftiest humanitarianism. Certainly it is to be regarded as an expression of benevolent paternalism guided by common sense rather than as a measure of oppressive absolutism.

In the literal sense of providing educational facilities of any sort for the lower class Egyptians, the statement that the Ptolemaic regime gave no heed to the education of the natives is true. The use of this observation, however, as a *criticism* of the regime does not seem to be warranted.[28] For the same thing can be said with equal correctness of educational opportunity, in the sense of school training, in any Greek

[25] See Napthali Lewis, "Μερισμος Ανακεχωρηκοτων" in *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, XXIII, 1937. Even in Lewis's article the complete change in the significance of the institution between the Ptolemaic and Roman periods is not sufficiently emphasized. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig, 1910), p. 217, seemed conscious of this change; but in his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 256 and 578-79, the difference which the *anachoresis* developed in Egypt under the Empire is not mentioned. PSI VII 822, of the second century after Christ, tells of a concerted action of a part of the workmen in the alabaster quarries which was a real "sit-down" labor boycott. It is significant that this is not called an *anachoresis*.

[26] It was called a πίστις. See the references in Friedr. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Heidelberg, 1924-31), *s.v.*, 4b; Woess, *Asylwesen*, pp. 184-92, *cf.* 120; Diedrich Schäfer in *Philologus*, XLII, 296-301; Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, I (Strassburg, 1915), no. 1414.

[27] This attitude is expressed with complete frankness in a royal decree, BGU VIII 1812, of 49-48 B.C.: "and those who have received the certificates of safe-conduct from us, [valid] until they are free from the labors of the farm plots".

[28] I refer to the criticism of the Ptolemaic rule upon this score voiced by Tarn in several of his studies.

city-state of the time. Gymnasial training and other educational facilities, if provided by the state at all, were at best limited to an upper social stratum, privileged both economically and socially. Surprising information has appeared within recent years which shows the swift spread of the Greek gymnasia into the villages of Egypt in Ptolemaic times. The list of these village gymnasia has been collected and discussed by Friedrich Zucker.[29] This new information compels us to alter our understanding of the opportunities available for the penetration of Greek higher training downward into the lower strata of the Egyptian villagers and of the ways in which this came about. The influences which seeped down to the natives from the gymnasia, existing in their midst as living institutions, must have been constant and insidious. Again the problem is one of private institutions, encouraged by the government but not founded by it. With the information which we have at our command, the depth of the cultural penetration of the gymnasia and the extent to which they succeeded in establishing new habits of thought among the Egyptians would be difficult if not impossible to trace. One superficial indication of the results of the spread of the gymnasia into the life of the Nile valley as the Greek immigration penetrated into the villages is now before us. This lies in the building of public bathhouses and their use by the village populations. Some of these were constructed by the state, with lease of the management of them to private persons under state concession. Others were built and operated by private individuals with their own capital. The well-known and enterprising Carian Greek, Zenon, was not above entering into the bathhouse business, both as

[29] "Γυμνασίαρχος Κώμης", in *Aegyptus*, XI (1931), 485-96. *Cf.* Wilcken's statement in *Grundzüge*, p. 138, that the gymnasial institution had penetrated into the metropoles of the nomes even in the Hellenistic period. See also H. Henne in *Bulletin de l'Institut français du Caire*, XXII, 191-202 and H. Kortenbeutel, "γυμνάσιον und βουλή", in *Arch. f. Pap.*, XII (1936), 44-53. Zucker's list shows three gymnasia in villages of the Fayum in Ptolemaic times. A fourth in the Heracleopolite village of Koma is known to have existed in 15-14 B.C., from BGU IV 1188. It probably went back to Ptolemaic foundation. The list and information gathered by Zucker is further strengthened by a *prostagma* of 124 B.C. which mentions the obligations resting upon the gymnasiarchs of the Arsinoite nome as if they were numerous. See P. Teb. III 1, 700, 45-49. T. A. Brady's study, *The Gymnasia in Ptolemaic Egypt*, University of Missouri Studies, XI (Columbia, 1936), 9-20, adds nothing of value to the conclusions given in the text above. Brady does not use the materials provided by the articles of Henne and Zucker referred to in this note. His decision that there was "clearly" no gymnasium in the town of Kerkeosiris (p. 15, n. 48) is obviously based upon lack of knowledge of the existence of the gymnasia in the villages. In view of Zucker's article the conclusion is no longer valid.

lessee of the state properties and as private investor of his own money.[30]

A complete study of the general welfare legislation of the Ptolemies would necessarily include the collection and examination of all material indicative of the attempts of the Ptolemies to conserve the small supply of trees which the Nile valley had and to increase the number both of fruit-bearing trees and of possible producers of lumber.[31] It should be extended to include the few suggestions of building restrictions which have come down to us, with the question constantly in mind, *cui bono.* In general it may be said that no building which, by position or use, fell within the general classification of edifices affecting the public welfare could be originally constructed, repaired, or torn down and rebuilt without first obtaining the consent of the local authorities.[32]

In the field of Ptolemaic law a process of syncretism began soon after the first Ptolemy took control of Egypt in 323 B.C. between the legal ideas of the Greek city-states, imported with the Macedonian conquest and the Greek immigration, and the looser and more paternalistic laws of Pharaonic Egypt. Where a compromise was effected between the two systems, it frequently left the more generous Egyptian attitude unimpaired.[33] This process of give and take in legal adaptation between native ideas and those of the alien elements speaks strongly against the customary assumption of a widespread and bitter hatred between the two. For example, the Greek city-state law upon guardianship was adopted in Egypt at an early stage of the Greek

[30] Consult C. C. Edgar in his introduction to P. Mich. I 46, and Alfred R. Schütz, *Der Typus des hellenistisch-ägyptischen Hauses* (dissertation, Giessen, 1936), pp. 21-24. An unpublished Columbia papyrus, Inv. no. 271, a letter to Zenon, adds another example to the list of the village and town bathing establishments in which Zenon was interested.

[31] In P. Teb. III 1, 703, lines 191-211, a *dioecetes* (treasurer general) gives instructions to a subordinate official upon the planting of mulberries, acacias, and tamarisks and the transplanting of them to the embankments of the irrigation ditches. In the notes the editors have collected a considerable number of the outstanding references upon the subject, which deserves, however, a special study.

[32] See the requests for building permits in the petitions published by Guéraud: for tearing down a linen manufactory and rebuilding two shops, P. Ent. 5; for right to rebuild a temple and a sanctuary, P. Ent. 6 and 7; permission granted to rebuild a gymnasium dedicated to the reigning king, P. Ent. 8, 10-11. The purpose expressed in P. Ent. 5 is the customary utilitarian one of increasing the revenues of the king. In no. 6 the official order is that the new structure shall not be inferior to the old. The implication in no. 8 (gymnasial reconstruction) is that the government desired to keep up, or better, the existing status of edifices in the town.

[33] This is shown in the law upon intestate inheritances affecting daughters. See R. Taubenschlag, *Atti del IV Congresso internationale di papirologia* (*Aegyptus,* Suppl., Serie scientifica, V, Milan, 1936), p. 278. In the fields of *patria potestas, materna potestas,* laws of guaranty, of obligation and inheritance, a syncretic system made up of the two types of law was developed. *Ibid.,* p. 281.

occupation, and from the third and second centuries we have specific cases which show that Greeks were legally admitted to guardianship over Egyptian women and willingly accepted by the native women as guardians.[34] The constant reference by the strategus of cases brought before him to settlement out of court by arbitration is a marked feature of the Ptolemaic procedure in the petitions which have come down to us.[35] Before the arbitrating court a part of the Egyptian law might be applied in cases dealing with Greeks, or Egyptians might, and did, accept a decision on the basis of Greek law.[36]

A decree of the middle of the third pre-Christian century found in the Rainer collection and recently published brings new evidence of the welfare attitude of the Ptolemaic rulers, however absolutistic they may have been in theory, however unaltruistic their motives.[37] About the year 262 B.C. it had been officially discovered by the government that a group of its subjects existed in Syria-Phoenicia who, though regarded by the Ptolemaic state from the legal standpoint as free men, were owned and employed as slaves.[38] The terms of the sovereign decree required that all persons of this category in the Syrian-Phoenician province should be brought before the resident officials and registered. Although there is no direct statement to that effect, it is clearly implied that they were to be restored to freedom, for a later clause of the decree provides that after its passage no subject of this classification of "free persons of the lower classes" in Syria-Phoenicia, with whom the *prostagma* concerns itself, might be bought or sold as slaves. This is welfare legislation dealing with the lowest stratum of a provincial population. The motives behind the passage of the decree are not stated in the document as preserved. They may have been wholly economic and entirely lacking in altruism. The result nevertheless was assuredly wholesome. To a distinct class of the population which was

[34] P. Teb. III 1, 814, and BGU 1249 are cited by Taubenschlag, *ibid.*, p. 268, n. 2.

[35] See P. Ent., index, *s.v.* **διαλύειν**. The same easy-going procedure is seen in the fact that persons accused and summoned before the court of the Ptolemaic strategus could not be condemned *per contumaciam* if they did not appear. P. Ent., no. 65, 4-5, note; Taubenschlag, Arch. f. Pap., IV (1908), 11-15.

[36] Taubenschlag, *ibid.*, p. 44.

[37] Herbert Liebesny, "Ein Erlass des Königs Ptolemaios II Philadelphos" (PER Inv. no. 24, 552 gr.), in *Aegyptus*, XVI (1936), pp. 257-91. The pertinent decree appears in the Greek text in col. I, 33-col. II. My interpretation of the document differs in vital points from that presented by Liebesny. The date of the decree itself, given in col. I, 22, is the twenty-fifth regnal year of a sovereign whose name is lost. In all probability it was Ptolemy II.

[38] The technical phrase for them is **σώματα λαικὰ ἐλεύθερα**, perhaps best translated as "enslaved persons of the peasantry who are free".

illegally enslaved it restored whatever liberty of movement appertained to free men of that locality and whatever additional satisfactions of the spirit these humble men might derive from the fact of their freedom.

In a recent study of the ideal picture of the Hellenistic king, Wilhelm Schubart has brought together and analyzed the qualities and virtues idealistically expected in a monarch of the Hellenistic period, those demanded of his officials, and the reciprocal devotion which the monarch's virtues were thought to evoke in his subjects.[39] The ruler was held responsible for good and just laws. He must be abhorrent of evil doing;[40] be of good intention; ready to forgive and to show this by grants of amnesty; a well-doer; a source of help; savior to all men. One acute observation of Dr. Schubart brings a valuable contribution to the problem of the relations between the Ptolemies as rulers and their subjects, whether native Egyptians or what-not. This is that when any of them were attacked or otherwise suffered injustice they called aloud upon the reigning king. The appeal to the king's name was, of course, merely symbolic, in the sense that the monarchs were not present and could not bear immediate aid.[41] By shouting for help in the king's name the person involved, according to Schubart's explanation, had given immediate publicity to the affair, and those who might rally about were by virtue of the appeal to the crown obligated to help the victim in his distress. The Ptolemy who happened to be reigning, whether personally able or personally worthless, had become quite literally the Helper of his subjects (ὁ βοηθός). And one sentence of the Rosetta decree now seems to represent something more than mere idealistic wordage. It is the statement that King Ptolemy, the God Epiphanes, had given generously of his own means and remitted or lightened the taxes "in order that the commonalty and all the rest might thrive under his royal sway".[42] The lower classes of Egypt here

[39] "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri", Arch. f. Pap., XII (1936), 1-26.

[40] This quality of μισοπονηρία, "righteous indignation", occurs particularly often in the documents of Ptolemaic Egypt. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 16. Such calls upon the king, or the reigning king and queen, are now known in four unmistakable cases, occurring at widely separate times. The references are: PCZ III 59451 and BGU III 1007, of the third century; P. Teb. III 1, 798, of the second; and BGU VIII 1762, of the first century B.C. Schubart adds PSI VI 551 and PCZ III 59520 (both of the Zenon group) as doubtful cases.

[42] OGI 90, 12-13. For the relation of this phrase to the ideal of the king as savior of his people see Schubart, Arch. f. Pap., XII, 14. In *Der alte Orient*, XXXV, no. 4, p. 37, Schubart speaks of the influence of the ideal of the kingship upon the people and their government.

stand first. "All the rest" of the population appear in second place.

The appeal for justice which regularly appears in the closing sentence of the Ptolemaic petitions for redress was a stock formula of the scribes who framed the documents.[43] As such it has no value as proof of the exercise of the quality of justice on the part of the officials. In like manner the admonitions of the strategi to the officials who conduct these cases, to see that the plaintiff meets with just treatment, are stereotyped. Quite rarely a petitioner refers to some economic or physical handicap under which he labors as a reason requiring special consideration for his case.[44] This is not a standardized formula. The expectation is evident that the decision will take this disability into account, as well as the legal aspects of the case.

Upon the official side, also, this humane and personal approach is attested. A nome governor may be seen meeting for amicable discussion with dissatisfied groups.[45] Again, in the important and interesting instructions of a higher official to a subordinate, which quite recently appeared, we find the following advice: "On your inspection trips try to cheer up the peasants by word of mouth and by investigation of their complaints against village scribes or comarchs regarding agricultural matters, and, as far as possible, put an end to such things."[46] The attitude of the higher official toward the subjects whom he ruled is completely utilitarian and authoritarian. But the entire tone of the long document is free from hackneyed and stereotyped phrases and has a really human and personal touch.[47]

[43] See P. Ent., index *s.v.* **δίκαιον**. These formulas have been collected and classified in accordance with their meaningless nuances by Paul Collomp, *Recherches sur la chancellerie et diplomatique des Lagids* (Strasbourg, 1926), pp. 115-124.

[44] *E.g.*, P. Ent., no. 25, 9, an elderly man with weak eyes; no. 26, 3, a case of pension received from his daughter by a man who asserts that he is physically weak and has bad eyes; no. 47, 6, an Arab, a barber, introduces the statement that he must live by his trade; no. 82, 7, a woman who earns her living by manual work; no. 22, 9, statement of a woman petitioning for appointment of a guardian, that she is aged and physically suffering; no. 48, 7, a hundred-aroura holder advances sickness as an element of his plea. *Cf.* PSI IV 421, 9, of the Zenon archive, in which dike-guards, complaining of nonpayment of their wages, say, **οὐ γὰρ ἰσχύομεν**, meaning that they are not, economically or socially, powerful persons. In BGU VIII 1782, *ca.* 57-56 B.C., we find that a dioecetes has reversed an action taken by the bureau of a strategus under him in confiscating the property of a woman.

[45] BGU VIII 1767, 5-6, to be dated about 64-63 B.C. The strategus met the petitioners in the gymnasium and talked with them "familiarly" (**οἰκειότερον διαλεχθείς**).

[46] P. Teb. III 1, 703, 40-49, of the late third century B.C. The higher official was probably a *dioecetes* (treasurer general) giving advice on the conduct of his office, presumably to an *oeconomus* (fiscal officer of a nome).

[47] Little initiative is left to the peasants. Everything must be listed by them under the

There is a certain attractive honesty and directness in the motives expressed by the Ptolemaic bureaucrats for their actions. They do not refer to abstract justice or appeal to right for right's sake. They frankly advise their subordinates to act in a certain manner because it is advantageous to the state's interests, not, expressly, in the interests of the subjects.[48] This idea was just as frankly and completely accepted by those who were ruled.[49] Lesser bureaucrats, also, are admonished that efficiency and close adherence to instructions are advisable because such qualities will be personally advantageous to those who practise them. If the orders are obeyed, "there will be for you complete safety", and "you will be deemed worthy of greater things".[50] The major problem of these documents is that of determining the degree of identification of the interests of the rulers and their functionaries with those of the governed.

With all its banausic emphasis upon profits, destined only for the treasury of the god-king, one has distinctly the impression that the Ptolemaic state in the first century B.C. had reached an equilibrium between the forces of a theoretical absolutism, a growing amount of private ownership of arable land, and popular institutions resistant to too grave oppression. In this gradual attainment of a balance between conflicting forces one feels that the Egyptian people, under a continuation of Ptolemaic rule, might have moved further along the way toward a fairly contented national life.[51] Intellectually it would probably have remained as undistinguished and have offered as little to the sum of human achievement as the Egyptian countryside, as differentiated from the cosmopolitan city of Alexandria, had previously contributed to Hellenistic culture. But certainly the Ptolemies did not do less than the Roman regime in respect of intellectual ferment

---

system of complete declarations so well known from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt—every producing field, every farm animal, the oil presses, and the linen looms.

[48] *E.g.*, the losses to the granary department of the state form the dominant consideration in P. Teb. III 1, 725, 5-6. *Cf.* no. 703, 231, 234: Everything is to be conducted in the best way. "You will thus secure safety for the countryside and [increase] the revenues no little." Utility for the state is customarily the basis for the grants of safe-conduct (πίστεις). See BGU VIII 1812, where the interest is in the tasks for which the people are held responsible. *Cf.* P. Teb. III 1, 741, 10-11.

[49] In the Zenon papyri the acceptance of this attitude may be seen, for example, in PCZ III 59467, 9, and PSI V 510, 5. For the later period see P. Ent. 5, 5; P. Teb. III 1, 701, lines 342-343, "in order that there may be no loss to the king"; *ibid.*, 786, 20-22, 33-37; *ibid.*, 787, 40-41; P. Teb. I 41, lines 26-27; *ibid.*, 50, 45.

[50] P. Teb. III 1, 703, lines 256, 275-76.

[51] The dynasty of the Ptolemies had, even in the second century B.C., made a complete adjustment with the native priesthood. *Cf.* H. I. Bell in *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, VIII, 147.

engendered in Egypt, and the condition of the native population assuredly deteriorated under Rome.[52]

Proof that the rule of the Ptolemaic dynasty rested upon the consent of its Egyptian subjects may be found in the following considerations. It endured for a century after the Macedonian kingdom had fallen a prey to Rome and equally long after Seleucid rule had lost all its vigor and its actual power had become a shadow.[53] To the Egyptians, Cleopatra VII, the last of her line to rule over Egypt, was a native queen. In the literature of her day and later she was an Egyptian.[54] Her last dramatic effort to build a great and substantial power by alliance with the Roman party of Marcus Antonius was necessarily made with a belief in the faithful adherence of the Egyptians to the cause of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Whatever weight historians may give to other causes in explaining the long duration of Ptolemaic rule,[55] Cleopatra's lustful dream of power would have been entirely vain and foolish had she not been confident of the support of her Egyptian subjects. It was not they who failed her. Apparently the mass of the Egyptian population did not, at any time during the Ptolemaic regime, deeply desire to rid itself of the Ptolemaic dynasty.[56]

A history of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt which is thrown in a flat projection, presenting the situation of the lower classes of the country in the two periods as an unchanging condition of rather hopeless misery, is inadequate to meet the test of the facts as we know them.[57] In comparison with the Ptolemaic attitude of paternal concern

[52] The intellectual output of the subsidized and alien scholarship of Alexandria, centering in the Museum, is to be regarded as Hellenistic-cosmopolitan, with no Egyptian stamp or quality of its own.

[53] The same observation is made by Schubart in *Der alte Orient*, XXXV, no. 4, p. 38.

[54] For the conversion of the Ptolemaic dynasty into a national ruling house see H. I. Bell in *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, VIII, 147. So far as I know, even Polybius does not mention or stress the Macedonian blood of the Ptolemaic house. To Plutarch, *Marcus Antonius*, 25, 2, Cleopatra is "the Egyptian". Pausanias, VI, 3, 1, and X, 7, 8, felt the need of insisting that the Ptolemaic house was, actually, of Macedonian descent.

[55] One must consider in the explanation of this historical fact the acuteness and realism of Ptolemaic diplomacy, its constant subservience to the demands of the Roman senate, the internal and external policies of Rome, the military and political weakness of Egypt which did not arouse the active fears of Roman leadership, and the *Tyche*, the goddess Chance, to which Polybius ascribes such importance in the conduct of human relations.

[56] This conclusion, expressed by H. R. Hall in *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, VI, 157, seems to me to be correct.

[57] Despite his comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the evidence upon Egypt from papyri and all other sources, the pages of Rostovtzeff's great book, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, pp. 255-71, seem to make too little of the economic changes introduced by Augustus and the general social effects which these produced.

and the loose reins of their control, the rule of Rome, without desire or intent to be so, was tight and rigid. It left little place for any national expression or for that national pride which means so much to peoples. The governmental machinery remained much the same, but the hands which directed the machine and the spirit which infused it had changed.

The question of blame for this change does not arise, but it is incumbent upon the historian to trace the causes, if he can. The first of these I would venture to find at the time of the change of rule to the Roman imperial control and, primarily, in an early decision taken by Augustus Caesar. Under the Ptolemies, after the established requirement had been fulfilled of feeding the national capital, "Alexandria near Egypt", the surplus of grain collected from the farms of Egypt had been sold in the markets of the Mediterranean. The surplus national wealth from this and other sources had gone into the treasury of a dynasty which soon identified itself with the Egyptian nation. It served the purposes and needs of a highly centralized rule, it is true, but these uses might well be regarded by the natives as national ones. When Augustus took control, their surplus of grain, over and above the needs of Egypt and Alexandria, was shipped to Rome to satisfy the food requirements of a new and voracious capital city, added to the old.[58]

A new king-god, in the person of the Roman emperor, took the place of the Ptolemaic sovereign, but he was an absent ruler and a distant god. Seldom, under Roman control, did the god make "appearances", *epiphaneiai,* in Egypt. The incident of the visit of Germanicus to Egypt in the winter of 18-19 A.D. is proof enough of the emotions which the presence of a mere cadet of the godly family of the Caesars might still evoke in that country. The land of Egypt, which produced its wealth, had formerly belonged, at least in theory, to a present god. When the country passed to Rome, the old royal domain of the Ptolemies went over, even with the same classification, to the god who lived at Rome. A part of the remaining land passed in large holdings into the ownership of absentee landlords of the imperial family, of the senatorial aristocracy, and of the wealthy *equites* of

[58] J. G. Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt", *Journal of Roman Studies,* XVII (1927), 3. On the two state granaries maintained in Alexandria, one for that city, the other for the *annona* destined for Rome, see Wilcken, "Zum Germanicus-Papyrus", in *Hermes,* LXIII (1928), 53-62.

Rome, presently to be absorbed into the holdings of the emperors.[59] The absentee owner has seldom in history distinguished himself as a gracious or considerate landlord, be he man or god.

When this fundamental change occurred in the habitat of the god who owned and ruled, now remote when once he had been near, the spirit of resilience and resistance which lay in the traditional institutions of old Egypt must have been lost. Rome was distant and detached in its interest. So far as Egypt was concerned its hand was a grasping and a heavy one, deadening in its effects.[60]

WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN.

Columbia University.

[59] For these estates and their reversion in the first century A.D. to imperial domain under the rubric of "privy domains" of the emperors (οὐσιακὴ γῆ) by confiscation and inheritance, see Wilcken, "Gr. Ostraka", I, 644, n. 2, Arch. f. Pap., I, 154; *Grundzüge*, p. 298; Otto Hirschfeld in *Klio*, II, 292-94; Rostovtzeff, *Röm. Kolonat*, pp. 120 ff., 133; and Paul Collart, introduction to P. Bouriant no. 42. The last listings of the οὐσίαι (privy domains) known to me are those of K. Thunell, *Sitologen-Papyri aus dem Berliner Museum* (Uppsala, 1924), pp. 72-76, and Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History*, pp. 572-76 (German ed., II, 293-98).

[60] In addition to the new charge of the grain supply for Rome upon Egyptian agricultural production Milne in his article in *Jour. Roman Studies*, XVII, 1-6, lists and discusses the following economic changes for the worse introduced after Augustus Caesar established the Roman regime in Egypt: (1) abandonment of the Ptolemaic state monopolies (with high tariff protection) for an inelastic system of trade licenses; (2) introduction of the poll tax, falling on the lower class population; (3) optional commutation of work on the irrigation dikes into money payments (disadvantageous because of the collapse of currency values); (4) surrender of agricultural land by the priesthood to the state in return for fixed annual subsidies paid them; (5) introduction of the system of collective liability laid upon the wealthy men for full payment of local taxes to the state; (6) injudicious and harmful manipulation of the currency problem in Egypt.

From the point of view of the psychological reactions of the native Egyptians the strict repression of the Egyptian priesthood under Roman rule deserves an emphasis which cannot here be given to it. The contrast in the handling of this problem between the Ptolemaic and the Roman regimes is mentioned by Schubart in *Der alte Orient*, XXXV, no. 4, pp. 32-33. See also H. Idris Bell, "Egypt under the Early Principate", *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, X, 313-15. Bouché-Leclercq, long ago, in his *Histoire des Lagids* (Paris, 1903-1907), III, 169 and n. 3, was conscious of the value of the group solidarities in the associations which the Ptolemies recognized legally. He also was clear as to the abuse of these institutions, with their former group reactions, when Roman administration changed them into a collective means of fiscal rule.

BRITISH TRADE TO THE SPANISH COLONIES, 1796-1823

It is a currently accepted view that England's trade with the Spanish colonies in the years preceding her recognition of the South American republics was legally justified by an arrangement concluded between herself and Spain in 1810.[1] In a conversation with Richard Rush in November, 1823, Canning took occasion to read the memorandum of conferences with Polignac stating that England "claims a right to trade with the colonies under a promise by Spain herself, given as long back as 1810, as an equivalent for British mediation offered at that date between the parent state and the colonies".[2] In March, 1824, Canning laid before parliament this version of the famous Polignac conversation and boldly claimed "that permission to trade with the Spanish colonies had been conceded to Great Britain in the year 1810; when the mediation of Great Britain between Spain and her colonies was asked by Spain, and granted by Great Britain". Only once has this statement been challenged. One critically minded member of the House of Commons remarked that he would like to see the text of the treaty mentioned in Canning's memorandum. To this Canning replied that as no written treaty had been concluded, no document existed, but that an agreement had been reached in that year giving the British legal access to the Spanish American ports.[3]

From that date until this, Canning's claim has been accepted at its face value. Yet an examination of the documents relating to the status of British trade to these regions in the years antedating Canning's statement leads inevitably to the conclusion that any such statement is false. That Canning was misinformed in this matter seems improbable. One must conclude, rather, that he was putting forth this claim of right in order to buttress his policy of nonintervention and to provide a legal mantle for a trade that was to a large extent regarded as illegal by the Spanish government. Convenient as a defense of the British position against French and Spanish pressure in the tense months of

[1] Leonard Axel Lawson, *The Relation of British Policy to the Declaration of the Monroe Doctrine* (New York, 1922), p. 82.

[2] Richard Rush, *Memoranda of a Residence at the Court of London* (Philadelphia, 1845), p. 451.

[3] Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, new ser., X, 710, 753-54.

1823-24, Canning's statement falls to the ground under the weight of the evidence of earlier years. A survey of the commercial relations of the British with the Spanish American colonies in the quarter century preceding his statement seems, therefore, desirable in order to determine clearly the status of British trade in those regions.

At the close of the eighteenth century Spain's monopoly of her colonial trade (save for the northwest coast of North America) was, in theory, complete. Almost three centuries of attempts on the part of other powers to secure the opening of this valuable commerce had proved fruitless as far as a legal footing was concerned. British whalers might sail on the waters of the South Seas under the Nootka Sound Convention, and settlers at the British colony at Belize might cut logwood by the terms of the Peace of Paris, but the ports of the Spanish colonies from the Caribbean to the shores of the Pacific were barred to foreign trading vessels.[4] That contraband trade in foreign products existed throughout the Spanish possessions is well known;[5] it is the transition from this status to that of a locally countenanced and quasi-legal intercourse and then to the final grant of free commerce by the Spanish in 1824 that is of interest.

I

The Spanish West Indies and the Spanish Main

In the face of the determination of Spain to maintain unchanged the Laws of the Indies as far as they related to foreign entry into her empire's trade, the British had since 1766 attempted to make the British West Indies an entrepôt for trade with the forbidden areas. The geography of the Caribbean pointed to that region as a convenient sphere for undermining the Spanish monopoly, a fact amply attested by the degree of contraband trade carried on there during the early eighteenth century.[6] Owing, moreover, to delimitations which existed

[4] William R. Manning, "The Nootka Sound Controversy", American Historial Association, *Annual Report*, 1904, p. 454. Richard Pares, *War and Trade in the West Indies, 1739-1763* (Oxford, 1936), especially pp. 540-55, 602-3. For a description of the Spanish trade regulations see William Walton, *Present State of the Spanish Colonies including a Particular Report of Hispaniola* (London, 1810), II, 153-80.

[5] H. M. Brackenridge, *Voyage to South America* (Baltimore, 1819), I, 83-84; II, 194-95. For an earlier period see Vera Lee Brown, "The South Sea Company and Contraband Trade", *American Historical Review*, XXXI (1926), 662-78, and her "Contraband Trade a Factor in the Decline of Spain's Empire in America", *Hispanic American Historical Review*, VIII (1928), 178-89.

[6] Pares, pp. 14-28, 114-27, 532-40.

as a matter of English law the whole Spanish possessions south of the Orinoco River and along the shores of the South Seas were closed to individual British trading, as will appear later. British policy, therefore, was first concentrated on the region of the Caribbean. From the passage of the first Free Ports Act in 1766 through successive emendations to the revisions of 1787 and 1805,[7] the purpose was the same—to foster and legitimize, as a matter of English law, trade between the British West Indian free ports and foreign plantations, a trade that was contraband in the eyes of every conscientious Spanish official.[8] In order to understand the developments of British relations with the Spanish colonies in the years following 1796 (the date of the outbreak of hostilities between Spain and England) it is necessary to review the regime established by the free ports acts in some detail.

The primary importance of the free ports system was that it opened designated ports in the British West Indies to small vessels owned and navigated by the subjects of any friendly European state, coming directly to the free ports from that state's colonial ports in the West Indies or America. Enumerated articles, including wool, cotton wool, indigo, cochineal, drugs, cocoa, logwood, fustic, furs, mahogany and other woods for cabinet wares, horses, mules and cattle, coin, bullion, and precious stones—the outstanding Spanish colonial products—might be imported. Rum, Negroes, and manufactures legally imported into the British islands (except naval stores) could be carried away from the free ports to the foreign plantations.[9]

At first sight this might seem to be a relaxation of the British navigation laws because it permitted the entry of foreign as well as British vessels to these ports. In actuality the free ports system was designed to stimulate British shipping, the nursery for the British navy.[10] In British vessels merchandise shipped from London and Liverpool or cargoes of Negroes from the African coast could be

[7] 6 Geo. III c. 49; 13 Geo. III c. 73; 14 Geo. III c. 41; 21 Geo. III c. 29; 27 Geo. III c. 27; 30 Geo. III c. 29; 32 Geo. III c. 37; 33 Geo. III c. 50; 38 Geo. III c. 39; 42 Geo. III c. 102; 45 Geo. III c. 57. Frank Lee Benns, "The American Struggle for the British West India Carrying-Trade, 1815-30", *Indiana University Studies,* X (1923), Study 56, p. 23, treats the act of 1805 as the initiation of a new policy. In actuality it was an amplification of one almost forty years old.

[8] Bryan Edwards, *History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies* (Philadelphia, 1806), I, 244-55. Sir William Young, *West India Commonplace Book* (London, 1807), pp. 167-94.

[9] This account of the system is based on 27 Geo. III c. 27. The list of enumerated articles varies somewhat in successive acts.

[10] Edwards, I, 255. Young, 176-77.

carried to the ports of Jamaica or the Bahamas; on the return trip to England the same vessels could be laden with the products of rival colonial empires legally obtained at Kingston, Nassau, or other designated harbors. The acts thus legitimized in the British West Indies what was punished as smuggling at Havana or Vera Cruz; and Spanish sailors on a Spanish vessel would alone bear the responsibility of evading the *guarda-costas*.

As a source of specie for the British West Indian islands the trade in peacetime was considerable;[11] and in addition the foreign colonies shipped indigo and cotton wool in large quantities to the free ports for the ultimate consumption of Lancashire mills. In 1791, it is estimated, the average imports of Jamaica alone under the free ports law totaled £150,000; large quantities of Negroes were sent out in the exchange trade, especially to Havana.[12]

The declaration of war between England and Spain in October, 1796, emphasized the value of this trade. On the one hand, communications between Spain and her colonies from this date until the end of the Napoleonic wars underwent serious interference.[13] The necessities of the Spanish colonies consequently made foreign intercourse imperative; from the misfortunes of their rivals the British were to reap new commercial advantages. On the other hand, the inception of hostilities between Spain and Great Britain automatically closed the trade between the two powers' colonial ports. That this situation inconvenienced the British colonies cannot be doubted. Some sort of intercourse with the Spanish colonies was necessary in order to secure specie. As the Spanish colonies needed manufactures, the merchants in the free ports were willing to run the risks involved in such a commerce provided it was sanctioned by the government. British merchants anxious for markets added their plea for a renewal of the trade.[14] In November, 1797, accordingly, instructions were issued to establish a trade between the free ports of Jamaica and the Bahamas and the Spanish colonies in the West Indies and on the Spanish Main. Virtually the same regula-

[11] Letter from Jamaica (unsigned), May 15, 1797, Colonial Office, 137/98, Public Record Office, London.

[12] Edwards, I, 245.

[13] *British and Foreign State Papers*, IV, 571. José Antonio Garciá y Garciá, ed., *Relaciones de los Vireyes del Nuevo Reinio de Granada* (New York, 1869), p. 497. *Cf.* Luis Marino Peréz, *Guide to the Materials for American History in Cuban Archives* (Washington, 1907), p. 57, for statistics on Spanish vessels at Havanna, 1797-98.

[14] Letter from Jamaica (unsigned), May 15, 1797, C.O. 137/98. Lieut. Gov. Alex. Houston to the Duke of Portland, Feb. 21, 1797, and Petition of Merchants of London, Dec. 1797, C.O. 101/35.

tions prevailed as under the peacetime relations of the free ports acts save that the stipulated British and Spanish vessels must procure licenses from the British colonial authorities.[15] This was not an innovation in English law, for trading with the enemy and the enemy's colonies under special license of the king was a well established practice.[16] Following the capture of Trinidad by the British in 1797, the licensing system was at a later date extended to the ports of that island; likewise it was used in Tobago and Tortola.[17]

To some extent the policy thus inaugurated by orders in council was successful. Complete statistics are lacking as to the exact value of the cargoes and the number of vessels engaged in this trade during the first Anglo-Spanish war period. At New Providence in the Bahama Islands between January and April, 1799, thirty foreign vessels entered the port, and forty foreign vessels cleared outwards bearing cargoes of British manufactured goods to Cuba and the Spanish settlements on the continent.[18] Puerto Cabello on the Spanish Main was a gathering place for the Spanish vessels sailing under the English pass; in 1801 one hundred vessels left that harbor with cargoes of cotton, coffee, and mules, to be delivered in the British West Indies.[19] Moreover, memorials and letters of merchants indicate that the war acted as a stimulus. Between the Bahamas and the ports of Santo Domingo, Cuba, and Vera Cruz the licensees carried valuable cargoes, and Nassau became important as a distributing point for British manufactures to the Spanish colonies.[20] Jamaica built up a lucrative trade with the island of San Andreas from which, it was claimed, British dry goods were smuggled to the most remote parts of South America and

[15] Portland to the Earl of Baliarreo, Nov. 22, 1797, and enclosed instructions issued by George III, Nov. 20, 1797, at St. James, C.O. 137/98. See also references to these instructions in a letter of Governor Dowdeswele to Portland, Jan. 7, 1799, C.O. 23/38.

[16] James Chitty, *A Practical Treatise on the Law of Nations,* etc. (Boston, 1812), pp. 265-76. See also 4 Robinson's Admiralty Reports 11. Examples of acts of parliament on this general subject are 33 Geo. III c. 27, 38 Geo. III c. 79, 39 Geo. III c. 98.

[17] Letter to Governor Hislop, Mar. 5, 1806, and Hislop to the Hon. Wm. Windham, July 4, 1806, and enclosures, C.O. 295/14; Downing Street to President Campbell, Mar. 5, 1806, C.O. 285/11; Downing Street to Lord Levington (draft of a letter to——No. 10), Dec. 4, 1806, C.O. 152/88.

[18] Dowdeswele to Portland, May 25, 1799, and enclosures, C.O. 23/38.

[19] Walton, II, 167.

[20] Dowdeswele to Portland, May 25, 1799, enclosing a report on trade for ports of Nassau of Jan.-Apr., 1799; same to same and enclosures, June 5, 1799; same to same, Aug. 6, 1799; Memorial of the Merchants of Glasgow trading to the Bahamas, Mar. 26, 1799, C.O. 23/38.

specie brought back to Kingston in exchange.[21] In addition some cargoes of American vessels condemned as prizes in British colonial ports were sold under the Spanish flag at Havana with the permission of the intendant.[22] To what extent this was done cannot be determined, but the practice was followed sufficiently to arouse the ire of American officials and to swell the volume of British trade to the Spanish ports.[23]

During the interim of peace between Great Britain and Spain, from March, 1802, to December, 1804, the Anglo-Spanish intercolonial trade continued;[24] from February, 1804, at least, the British resorted to the licensing system.[25] Kingston in Jamaica and Port of Spain in Trinidad (the latter reaping the golden opportunities afforded by its location) were the busiest ports. To Kingston between January, 1804, and January, 1805, from the Spanish Main, for example, came imports of over a million dollars in return for which British products—casks, soap, yard goods, blankets, axes, etc.—were sent out.[26] In the same year $850,000 of British manufactures were shipped to the Spanish Main from Port of Spain in Trinidad, in 1805-6 the total reached $1,000,000 and during the first six months of 1806 touched the figure of $650,000. Of this, 7/10 of the value was in cotton and linen manufactures, 1/10 in woolens, and 2/10 was shared by hardware and rum.[27] The value

[21] Copy of Memorial of Merchants of Kingston to Sir Eyre Coote, enclosure no. 4 in dispatch 22, Coote to Viscount Castlereagh, May 17, 1806, C.O. 137/116.

[22] J. Morton to Madison, Dec. 11, 1801, Department of State, Washington, Consular Letters, Havana, vol. I.

[23] *American State Papers, Foreign Relations,* III, 102.

[24] *British and Foreign State Papers,* V, 1016. *Parliamentary History of England,* XXXVI, 874.

[25] In 1806 a request for information was made by the Committee of the Privy Council for Trade and Plantations on the extent of trade from the British West Indies to the Spanish Main and West Indies covering the period Feb. 5, 1804-Feb. 5, 1806 (see, for example, Downing Street to President Campbell, Mar. 5, 1806, C.O. 285/11), thus indicating a resort to the licensing system after the preliminary break between Spain and Great Britain in 1803 and previous to the actual declaration of hostilities in December, 1804. For the reports of the governors in reply to this request see below notes 26, 27, 28, and also Wm. Arnold, collector of customs (Tobago), July 1, 1806, C.O. 285/11. In 1806 the license fee was reduced to £1. Downing Street to Coote, June 5, 1806, C.O. 137/116.

[26] Report on trade (enclosure), Coote to Castlereagh, May 17, 1806, C.O. 137/116. This report shows also a small amount of trade to Port Antonio, Lucca, Montego Bay, and Savannah La Mar in the island of Jamaica. In the case of Montego Bay a further enclosure indicates that the trade from that port was solely with Cuba and not with the Spanish Main. See also G. B. Hutchinson to Col. Walsh, Oct. 14, 1806, and enclosed accounts of exports from Kingston to Spanish colonies, etc., *ibid.*

[27] Hislop to Windham, July 4, 1806, enclosure no. 2, C.O. 295/14.

of the imports brought to Port of Spain in small Spanish vessels is shown by the following table:

Date	Spanish vessels	Value of cargo
1804-5	873	$663,910
1805-6	674	859,475
1806-Sept. 1806	406	528,480[28]

There were, however, a good many drawbacks to the expansion of this trade. In the first place, it was accompanied by certain hazards. Despite the weakness of the Spanish government, beset by European complications, efforts were made to enforce Spanish colonial laws; and *guarda-costas* patrolling the waters of the Spanish Main prevented an open acknowledgement of the intercourse with the free ports.[29] Similarly, Spanish ships, even though bearing a license properly issued at Nassau or Kingston, were occasionally seized by zealous British armed vessels on the ground that they carried imperfect registers. Since, from the Spanish point of view, the Spanish vessels so engaged were merely smugglers, it was not always possible for them to obtain correct documents from their own authorities. The failure of the British to honor the king's license under all circumstances was an additional embarrassment and interfered to some extent with the success of the trade.[30]

It should be noted, moreover, that the free ports system, whether in peacetime or during hostilities, was designed distinctly for the purposes of furthering British navigation and industry rather than with the intent of providing for the necessities of the colonists. But the crying need of the British West Indies from the outbreak of the wars of the French Revolution was for food. No essential commodities such as wheat, flour, or fish could be imported legally from the Spanish colonies.[31] The British colonial merchant could, it is true, forward the indigo, cocoa, and cotton of the Spanish Main to the West India docks

[28] *Ibid.*, enclosure no. 3.

[29] Memorial of Merchants of Kingston to Coote, enclosure no. 4 in dispatch 22, Coote to Castlereagh, May 17, 1806, C.O. 137/116.

[30] Dowdeswele to Portland, June 5, Aug. 6, 1799, and enclosed Memorial of Merchants, C.O. 23/38. Walton (II, 168-70) asserts that it was very easy for the Spanish vessels to get false certificates as the Spanish officials, because of their eagerness to share in the profits, readily furnished the desired papers.

[31] This holds true of the trade until the year 1808. In that year, by 48 Geo. III, c. 125, the importation of rice, grain, and flour was permitted. This was probably due to the stringency produced by the American embargo. Larger vessels were permitted by the acts of 50 Geo. III c. 21, 52 Geo. III c. 20, and 54 Geo. III c. 48.

at London, but he could not with these satisfy a planter population pressed by famine. Food stuffs the Spanish colonies of the Caribbean were largely unable to furnish even had the licensing system permitted their importation; indeed the Spanish islands such as Cuba were equally troubled for adequate provisions.[32] It was the United States alone that could with ease supply the requisite thousands of barrels of wheat and flour, and as a result both Spanish creole and British colonial were forced to turn to the Americans. Reluctant as were the British authorities to permit the entrance of American ships to the British free ports, the exigencies of the colonists again and again forced colonial governor, ministry, or parliament to legalize such entry.[33] It is noteworthy that in 1806 the authorities at Tobago confessed that the relations of Tobago with the Spanish Main were insignificant and that the island was absolutely dependent on the United States and would suffer famine unless permitted to trade with them.[34] At the same date the governor of Trinidad asserted that the commerce of Port of Spain with the Americans was twenty times as great as that with any other region.[35] The strictures of the free ports system, coupled with the native economic limitations of the Spanish colonies, account in part for the failure of the trade to achieve greater proportions.

Probably the greatest obstacle to such a development, however, lay in the competition of the Americans, a circumstance which minimized the importance of the free ports as markets for the Spanish colonies. For the vessels of the United States occupied a peculiarly favorable position. During two periods, 1797-99 and 1804-6, they were welcomed as neutrals in the very ports from which the British were barred.[36] This naturally aroused some resentment among the British colonials, especially as they suspected that much of this business was supported by Spanish capital. In 1799 the governor of the Bahamas, at the instance

[32] Morton to the Secretary of State, Jan. 20, Mar. 17, 1802; Henry Hill to the Secretary, June 12, 1805, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Havana, vol. I. This material is also referred to in Professor Roy F. Nichols's article, "Trade Relations and the Establishment of the United States Consulates in Spanish America, 1779-1809", *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIII (1933), 289-313.

[33] Benns, *Indiana University Studies*, X, no. 56, pp. 1-24; L. J. Ragatz, *The Fall of the Planter Class in the British Caribbean, 1763-1833* (New York, 1928), pp. 286-330.

[34] Report of Arnold, July 1, 1806; "Observations on Imports, 1794-1806" (appended to Report on Imports from U. S. to Tobago), C.O. 285/11.

[35] Letter of Hislop, Nov. 9, 1806, with reports on imports and exports from the U. S., C.O. 295/14.

[36] Garciá, p. 499. Nichols, *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIII, 296, 301, 306. See also Baptis Irvine, "Notes on Venezuela", p. 162, Dept. St., Special Agents.

of the merchants of Nassau, complained of this situation. To remedy it, a request was made that the trade between Nassau and the Spanish Main be opened to American vessels, which would ensure, it was hoped, a valuable entrepôt commerce by American ships in British goods, especially with Vera Cruz.[37] This proposal the British ministry peremptorily refused. Some commercial advantage might result, it was admitted, but "the more important interest of the navigation of this Kingdom" would suffer. The advance of the Americans in shipping during the past five years had been to the detriment of Great Britain; therefore no such measure would be permitted.[38] As Sir William Young later declared, the object of the navigation system was imperial power, not profit. The growth of American shipping was feared as a menace to Britain's navigation as well as to her commerce.[39]

The Americans, furthermore, possessed an inestimable advantage as carriers between the Spanish colonies and Europe. To Cuba they could bring not only their own greatly desired flour but Russian linens and German hardware as well. And returning from Havana or Vera Cruz to New York, Boston, or New Bedford, by the simple expedient of re-exportation they could dispose of the cargoes of Spanish colonial products, especially sugar, in the markets of Cadiz, Hamburg, or Amsterdam. It was this aspect of American competition that particularly aroused the British. In 1805 James Stephen in his famous pamphlet, *War in Disguise or Frauds of Neutral Flags,* savagely denounced this practice. The Spanish colonies, he wrote, "are quietly reaping the fruit of that fortunate revolution, the suspension of their prohibitory laws. The neutral flag gives to them not only protection but advantages before unknown. The gigantic infancy of agriculture in Cuba, far from being checked, is greatly aided in its portentous growth during the war, by the boundless liberty of trade, and the perfect security of passage. . . . To the Spanish continental colonies also, war has changed its nature; it has become the handmaid of commerce, and the parent of plenty." [40]

Nor can it be doubted that Stephen was justified in his conclusions and that the specter of American trade rivalry for the Spanish colonial

[37] Dowdeswele to Portland, Jan. 23, 1799, C.O. 23/38.

[38] To Dowdeswele, Apr. 6, 1799, *ibid.*

[39] Young, pp. 154-55. See also *Parliamentary History of England,* XXXVI, 351-54, and Hansard, IX, app., p. lxxiv.

[40] London, 1806, 4th ed., pp. 70-73, 75-76. See also *Concessions to America the Bane of Britain* (London, 1807), p. 8.

trade had a real substance. Annual reports of the United States Treasury on the trade between Cuba and the Spanish West Indies and the United States demonstrate conclusively the value of that trade and its increase year by year.[41] Furthermore the reports of American consular agents in Havana make clear the fact that the American interest far outstripped that of the British in that port. During four months in 1805, for example, 175 American vessels entered the harbor of Havana, 25 Spanish ships, and only one English vessel.[42] Indubitably, Cuba was dependent on the United States and not on the free ports of the British West Indies.

To some extent the advantage enjoyed by the Americans as carriers between the Spanish colonies and European ports was impaired by the decision of Sir William Scott in the case of the *Essex* (July 23, 1805) and the subsequent stringent orders in council that established the British blockade of European ports. But this did not touch direct trade between the United States and the Spanish colonies. Roused by a letter from the British consul to the Middle and Southern states on the importance of this commerce, the British Board of Trade in 1807 took up the matter. They were informed, however, by the advocate general that unless the Spanish government or Spanish subjects had a legal property or share in the goods carried, trade from a neutral to a Spanish colony could not be interfered with. England herself permits it even if Spain does not, he said, and entry by license and by payment of a duty are equally legal.[43]

In 1808 the invasion of Spain by Napoleon and his attempts to subjugate that country threw the Spanish leaders into the arms of the British and ended the hostilities between those nations. In July, 1808, temporary peace was concluded; in January, 1809, a definitive treaty of alliance for the duration of the war against France was signed by Great Britain and the Spanish patriot group, whom she recognized as the government of Spain. But not even this enlistment in a common cause secured for Great Britain any increase of commercial privileges in the Spanish colonies by treaty; in theory, at least, the wall of the Laws of the Indies continued to hedge the Spanish colonial possessions despite

[41] Nichols, *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIII, 296, n. 25, and 303, n. 44.

[42] Henry Hill to the Secretary of State, June 12, 1805, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Havana, vol. I. See also the earlier letters of Morton to the Secretary, Apr. 21, 1801, Jan. 20, Mar. 17, 1802, *ibid.*

[43] Nov. 7, 1807, Board of Trade Minutes, 5/17, p. 98, Public Record Office. For further evidence of the Board of Trade's interest in the license trade to the Spanish Main, which they termed "a trade of infinite value to this country", see *ibid.*, pp. 412-13.

turmoil and confusion at home.[44] In actuality, during the uncertain months and years that followed the fatal coronation of Joseph Bonaparte at Madrid in 1808, the enforcement of the Spanish trade laws varied from Spanish colony to colony, depending on the needs of each particular locality and the attitude of the officials in each case. Moreover, the changing circumstances of each year, particularly from 1810 on, led to such variation of regulation that no generalization as to the enforcement of the Spanish laws for the whole area of the Spanish Empire holds true. By the treaty of 1809 Great Britain gained no commercial advantage, but the exigencies of the Spanish colonists, coupled with the prostration of authority in Spain, did inevitably make breaches in the enforcement of the whole body of Spanish restrictions. In 1809, for example, the Supreme Junta of patriots in Spain were still keeping the ports of the Spanish Main closed. Yet in the same year the governor of Havana, with their approval, opened that port to foreign commerce, even though such an act was recognized as being in contravention of the Laws of the Indies.[45] On the other hand, a year later the Spanish merchants at Vera Cruz protested strongly against any similar innovations in that city.[46] Not even the need of the British for specie in 1810 to support the British regiments fighting Spain could secure the opening of Vera Cruz as a source of supply for bullion.[47]

[44] For the text of the preliminary treaty of July 4, 1808, see George Fréd de Martens, *Nouveau recueil de traités* (Göttingen, 1817), I, 86-87; the text of the definitive treaty of January 14, 1809, is found on pages 163-66. The treaty does not establish general commercial regulations save in the appended additional article (p. 166), which provides for the establishment of trade on a reciprocal basis but makes no mention of either's colonial commerce. In view of the long-standing Spanish policy of differentiating trading rights to Spain from trading rights to her colonies, this article, by accepted rules of treaty interpretation, can only mean the granting of mutual rights of entrance to the ports of the mother countries. Evidence for the correctness of such an interpretation is furnished by the manuscript material cited below in notes 45 and 46. Professor Nichols (*Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIII, 317) says that in 1808 Great Britain "had the freedom of Cuban ports and Spanish commerce had the protection of the British fleet". The trade was tolerated in certain ports by local regulation but had no treaty basis.

[45] Harrison to Charles Bagot, Aug. 24, 1809, Foreign Office 72/90, Public Record Office. Sir Sidney Smith to Viceroy Chevalier de Liniers, Mar. 18, 1809, F.O. 72/91. James Anderson to Robert Smith, Secretary of State, Apr. 3, 14, 1809, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Havana, vol. II. Hansard, VII, 1729.

[46] Wm. Gregory to the Secretary of State, Jan., 1809, F.O. 72/90. For similar protests of the Spanish merchants in Porto Bello against proposals to open that port see Charles E. Chapman, *Catalogue of Materials in the Archivo General de Indias for the History of the Pacific Coast and the American Southwest* (Berkeley, 1919), pp. 703, 705, 708.

[47] H. Perewel to [George Canning ?], Mar. 16, 1810, F.O. 72/90. Wellington to the Rt. Hon. Henry Wellesley, Aug. 2, 1811; same to Captain General Don F. X. Castaños, Dec. 18, 1811, in John Gurwood, ed., *The Dispatches of Field Marshall the Duke of Wellington* (London, 1837-39), VIII, 165, 467-68.

Meantime the rivalry of the United States merchants for the Spanish Caribbean trade continued to affect British prospects in that region. Although the closing months of the year 1808 witnessed a great increase of British trade with Cuba, by 1810 the Americans, freed from the restraints of the embargo (December, 1807-March, 1809), had regained their former footing and wrested business from the British.[48] On the Spanish Main, likewise, the British felt the pinch of American competition. "The complaints that are made from every quarter of the globe of the great interference of American intercourse with the trade from our own colonies have induced us to submit the two enclosed letters for your consideration, in the hope that you will be enabled to make some arrangements with the Spanish Ambassadors to grant a facility to the British trade or at least prevent the Americans, or any other power, from having a preference to us", wrote a firm of London merchants in 1809. During the existence of the American embargo, the letter continued, a trade with the Spanish Main in British manufactures had developed at Curaçoa. After the Americans re-established free intercourse there was no market for British goods. An accompanying enclosure reported that Americans were infesting the ports of Curaçoa like a plague, that they were even offering for sale in that place goods from the British East Indies, and that American smuggling to La Guayra was notorious.[49]

In 1810 the outbreak of revolution in the captaincy general of Venezuela introduced a new element into the trade situation of the Caribbean. For here, as in other parts of South America, the inception of the revolution was signalized by the establishment of free commerce. After April 19, 1810, the Junta of Caracas opened the ports of that region to the vessels of all nations.[50] An especially favorable position was secured for the British through the efforts of the governor of Curaçoa, who obtained from the revolutionary Junta of Caracas a reduction of one fourth of the duties on British exports and imports. Several British commercial houses were established at La Guayra, and it was rumored

[48] Anderson to Smith, Apr. 3, 14, 1809; William Shaler to Smith, Sept. 22, Nov. 19, 1810, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Havana, vol. II. *Cf.* Nichols, *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIII, 310. Professor Nichols ascribes the drop in American trade in 1808-9 to a new Spanish policy of favoring the British rather than to the operation of the embargo. The increase in American trade from 1809 to 1812 indicates, however, that the embargo had been in part responsible for the sudden drop.

[49] Brown, Rogers, and Brooks to the Rt. Hon. Spencer Perceval, Aug. 19, 1809, and enclosure (Dunbar V. McWhirton to Brown, Rogers, and Brooks, June 26, 1809), F.O. 72/90.

[50] Diego Barros Arana, *Obras completas* (Santiago de Chile, 1908-14), II (*Historia de America*), 240.

that British and Spanish privateers were ordered not to molest British ships going to the Spanish Main.[51] The negotiations of the revolutionary leaders for aid from the British ministry, the already established precedent of Spanish traffic to the free ports, the favorable attitude of the British West Indian governors toward the revolution,[52] and the contiguity of the free ports (especially those of Tinidad) were all factors in favor of the British; and during the years 1811 and 1812 British trade in La Guayra flourished to the envy of the Americans.[53]

The outbreak of the War of 1812 further strengthened the British position in the Caribbean. Here, as elsewhere, the British blockade of American ports, the seizure of American merchantmen on the high seas, and the embargoes laid by Congress in 1812 and in 1813 militated against American commerce and simultaneously gave the British superior opportunities, for the contraction of American trade enhanced correspondingly the value of the supplies brought by the British. In 1813 Porto Bello was opened for trade with the British West Indies,[54] at La Guayra the British merchants maintained their unquestioned lead,[55] and a large contraband trade in flour sprang up between Jamaica and Vera Cruz.[56] This trade was probably due to the dire need of the British West Indian colonies for provisions; indeed for the period of the War of 1812 successive British orders in council considerably relaxed the restrictions on the articles to be brought into the free ports and in particular authorized by a licensed trade the entrance of provisions in the vessels of any nation except those of France.[57] In addition, British trade with Cuba was greatly stimulated during the War of 1812, and trade from Great Britain to Havana direct rather than by way of the free ports became of increasing value. The governor of Cuba, evidencing a strong bias against the United States and a great partiality to Great Britain, established a preferential duty on products

[51] Robert Lowry to the Secretary of State, Sept. 6, Oct. 1, Dec. 18, 1810, Dept. St., Consular Letters, La Guayra, vol. I.

[52] Don Luis Mendez to Castlereagh, Oct. 12, 1812, F.O. 72/157. In 1815, however, it was stated that the governor of Curaçoa had refused to aid the patriots, Hansard, XXX, 159. This change in the governor's policy was probably due to instructions from the home government. See Wellington to Wellesley, July 14, 1811, *Dispatches,* VIII, 107.

[53] Lowry to the Secretary of State, June 9, 1811, Feb. 2, 1812, Dept. St., Consular Letters, La Guayra, vol. I.

[54] Chapman, pp. 703, 705, 708.

[55] Lowry to the Secretary of State, Dec. 6, 1816, Dept. St., Consular Letters, La Guayra, vol. I.

[56] Morier to Castlereagh, Feb. 13, 1813, F.O. 72/156.

[57] *British and Foreign State Papers,* I, 1357-60, 1373-75.

brought in British ships to Havana. This resulted in the practical exclusion of the Americans from that trade. Goods from Germany and Russia as well as products of the British Isles were imported by British merchants.[58] While the statistics on American trade with Cuba between 1812 and 1814 show a shrinkage in value, British exports to Cuba totaled £ 63,457, 6*s*., 3*d*. in the year 1812 and rose to £ 203,380, 15*s*., 1*d*. in 1814.[59] Theodore Kilbee, British agent at Havana for some years, later affirmed that during the War of 1812 the British completely supplanted their American rivals in the Cuban trade.[60]

During these same years the trade relations of Venezuela were seriously affected by the strife of royalist and patriot. As early as July, 1810, the Regency of Spain had declared a blockade of all ports in Venezuela.[61] As the royalists regained control and enforced the blockade, commerce suffered accordingly. In 1813, for example, the fall of Puerto Cabello to the royalists caused a decrease in communication with Port of Spain in Trinidad. In the first six months of that year 115 Spanish vessels from the Spanish colonies in South America entered Port of Spain, in April, 32, in May, 34, and in June, 23. And in July, due to the rigor of the royalist blockade, only 15 vessels reached that port. Indeed, in a private letter to Earl Bathurst the governor confessed that shortly after his arrival he found commercial intercourse with the Spanish Main entirely suspended because of the royalist blockade.[62] A few months later the English ship *Dolce Nombra de Maria* was seized and made prize by the royalists on the charge of trading with the insurgents.[63] The table of British exports to Caracas tells the same story. In 1812 over eighty-five thousand pounds sterling of exports were sent; in 1815 but a little over five thousand pounds sterling were recorded.[64] From this time on, until the triumph and declaration of free commerce by the Republic of Colombia, the trade relations of the Spanish Main were subject to recurrent blockades by royalist and patriot alternately.[65] These blockades, coupled with an

[58] Stephen Kingston to James Monroe, July 4, 12, 13, 1812, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Havana, vol. II.

[59] *American State Papers, Commerce and Navigation,* I, 970, 1007, and II, 4; *British and Foreign State Papers,* IV, 571.

[60] Kilbee to Castlereagh, Dec. 13, 1819, F.O. 72/227.

[61] Diego Barros Arana, II, 241.

[62] Ralph Woodford to Earl Bathurst, July 7, Aug. 3, 1813, and enclosures, C.O. 295/29.

[63] C. Shipley to Bathurst, Oct. 11, 1813, F.O. 72/166.

[64] *British and Foreign State Papers,* IV, 571.

[65] *American State Papers, Foreign Relations,* IV, 156-59. In theory the Spanish autho-

inevitable decrease in the economic resources of the region during these troubled years, seriously affected commercial relations with these ports. In the last six months of the year 1815, for example, 129 Spanish vessels, cleared from the Spanish Main, entered Port of Spain; during the same period of the following year 49 vessels reached that port, indicating a decrease in the volume of trade as the war of royalist and patriot dragged on.[66]

The conclusion of peace between Great Britain and Spain in 1814, by the terms of the commercial treaty between those countries, restored British relations with the Spanish colonies to the same footing as had existed in the year 1796.[67] This of course meant that by treaty the Spanish claimed and the British accepted the Spanish eighteenth century theory of a "closed trade". In actuality, however, in the years following the conclusion of this commercial convention there was a vast divergence between the treaty stipulations and the actual practice in the Caribbean. By local regulation, either of Spanish official or of revolutionary group, the ports of the Spanish Main, as has been seen, had been gradually opened; on February 9, 1824, in an empty gesture of conciliation, the Spanish government practically acknowledged this fact and freed all the ports of South America from its restrictions.[68] The last steps in the transition from the status of contraband trade to that of commerce permitted by local regulation and then to that of legalized intercourse were thus taken, so far as the Spanish Main was concerned.

In the case of Cuba, meantime, a somewhat similar evolution took place. Between 1814 and 1818 trade to Havana continued under regulations issued by the governor; a freer intercourse with foreign nations was allowed by the Spanish crown in 1818.[69] In regard to that island, however, the British were soon outstripped by the Americans, who had rapidly regained their pre-eminence at Havana after the close of the

---

rities refused to recognize these actions as a "blockade". It was merely, they stated, a maintenance of the full vigor of the Laws of the Indies, which had been relaxed in latter times so that foreign vessels were permitted to trade. *Ibid.*, p. 157. See also *Niles' Register*, XI, 187, and XII, 78.

66 Woodford to Bathurst, Jan. 3, 1816, and enclosures, C.O. 295/39. Report of James Meary, 1816-17, "A General Account of the articles imported by Spanish Launches, number of arrivals & the value of Dry Goods exported from July 1st to the 31st Dec. 1816", probably enclosed in Woodford to Bathurst, Nov. 26, 1817, C.O. 295/44.

67 *British and Foreign State Papers*, I, 292-93.

68 *Ibid.*, XI, 864-65.

69 *Ibid.*, V, 1004. See also James Callahan, *Cuba and International Relations* (Baltimore, 1899), p. 116.

War of 1812.[70] By the close of the year 1818 fifty American vessels were reaching Havana monthly; in 1819 out of the eight to nine hundred merchants entering that port annually some six hundred belonged to the United States, although the British ranked next in point of numbers.[71] Direct trade between Great Britain and Cuba rather than from the free ports constituted apparently the bulk of this commerce, for in 1820 it was claimed that British trade to Cuba engaged ten to twelve thousand tons of shipping each year and millions of pounds sterling in capital.[72] In January, 1822, the cortes of Spain finally decreed the ports of Cuba open to foreign trade.[73] New Spain (Mexico), it is true, appears to have remained closed save by the special permission of passport and license until 1821,[74] but in other respects by that date the trade of the Spanish colonies in the Caribbean was already largely open to all foreign nations. In January, 1823, the cortes of Spain decreed that the privileges already accorded to Cuba should be extended to all the provinces of Ultramar for a term of ten months in favor of all those nations which the government might think proper to include.[75] This was done to alleviate the British resentment of Spanish captures of British vessels trading in the Caribbean, but except for the island of Porto Rico the decree was meaningless in the face of the success of the revolutions in Mexico, Central America, and South America.

The result of all these circumstances—the gradual opening of the Spanish ports in the Caribbean by local authorities, the decrees of the Spanish crown between 1818 and 1824 regularizing free access to those ports, the earlier development of trade direct from Great Britain to

[70] Kilbee to Castlereagh, Dec. 13, 1819, F.O. 72/227.

[71] Geo. P. Stevenson to John Quincy Adams, Dec. 4, 1818, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Havana, vol. III. Kilbee to Castlereagh, Dec. 13, 1819, F.O. 72/227.

[72] Memorial of the British Merchants of Havana to the Lords Commissioners for executing the office of Post Master General, Nov. 30, 1820, F.O. 72/261. For later dispatches relating to the trade and political rivalry of the United States and Great Britain in Cuba see Kilbee to William Hamilton, private no. 1, June 30, Mar. 3, 1820; same to Earl of Clanwilliam, July 22, Sept. 3, Nov. 26, 1822; unsigned letter relating to Havana, Nov. 1822; and Kilbee to Clanwilliam, Dec. 20, 1822, *ibid.* In the House of Commons in 1821 it was stated that only one twentieth of the commerce of Cuba was with Great Britain. Hansard, new ser., V, 1306.

[73] *British and Foreign State Papers,* X, 865-67.

[74] *American State Papers, Foreign Relations,* IV, 198. William Davis Robinson, *Memoirs of the Mexican Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1820), pp. 265-66; W. S. Robertson, *Hispanic American Relations with the United States* (New York, 1923), p. 191.

[75] *British and Foreign State Papers,* X, 867-68. For previous mention of the Spanish depredations on British commerce see *ibid.*, IX, 897-98.

Cuba and the Spanish Main, and the increasing rivalry of American interests in the Caribbean—combined to undermine the free ports system. Overhauled in 1817 and 1818 by parliament and re-established in operation under peaceful conditions, the restrictive aspect of the free ports policy was virtually abandoned, 1822-1825, with the modifications in the British navigation system.[76] In the face of the changed commercial conditions that characterized the post-Napoleonic period and the rise of the new states in South America, the reasons for the adoption and fostering of that policy had lost their vitality. The elaborate machinery of the entrepôt trade was no longer necessary. A survey of British relations with the Spanish colonies in the Caribbean from the stages of the entrepôt contraband trade to direct legal commerce with those ports demonstrates, however, the frailness of Canning's claim as to rights granted by any treaty in 1810.

II

Other Spanish American Colonies

At the close of the eighteenth century the position of the British in relation to the Spanish colonies of South America other than those already discussed rested on a different footing. To attempt a similar mode of trade relations with the distant stretches of the Rio de la Plata or the far coasts of Chile and Peru presented greater geographical difficulties. In addition, other barriers supervened. As far as the west coast of South America was concerned, the British king himself was bound by the terms of the Nootka Sound Convention of 1790 to prevent the navigation and fishing of his subjects in the Pacific or the South Seas from being made a pretext for illicit trade with the Spanish colonies. This treaty had expressly stipulated that the British should not navigate or fish within the distance of ten maritime leagues of any part of those coasts already occupied by Spain. That infringements of this stipulation occurred was inevitable. Indeed, the failure of the British to observe this article of the Nootka Sound Convention was cited by the king of Spain as one of the causes for his declaration of war against

[76] 57 Geo. III c. 74 and 58 Geo. III c. 27. The changes in the policy were effected by 3 Geo. IV c. 44, 45, 4 Geo. IV c. 77, and especially 6 Geo. IV c. 73, 6 Geo. IV c. 105, 6 Geo. IV c. 114. See also W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times* (Cambridge, 1892), II, 592-93.

Great Britain in the year 1796,[77] and occasional seizures of British vessels indicate the validity of the Spanish claim.[78]

Furthermore, a certain bar to the development of British trading ventures to the Rio de la Plata, Chile, and Peru existed in English law because of the terms of the monopoly held by the South Sea Company, chartered in the reign of Queen Anne and enjoying under the early Hanoverians the privileges granted to the British by the Treaty of Utrecht. The story of the commercial operations of that company in the Spanish American colonies during the first half of the eighteenth century has already been told;[79] nor is it necessary to review here the extinction of the British treaty privileges by the Convention of 1750 and the subsequent winding up of the company's overseas ventures.[80] But the monopoly granted by the English crown to the company in their charter was not terminated by these events, even though the British no longer possessed legal access to the Spanish colonies. As against other British traders the South Sea Company retained by charter the sole right to take fish in the South Seas and to trade to any place on the east coast of South America below the Orinoco river or to the west coast of that continent under the dominion of the Spanish crown.[81]

That the English crown recognized the persistence of the South Sea Company's rights was amply demonstrated in 1785. At that date the firm of Richard Cadman Etches and Company of London laid before the government proposals for opening a trade to the northwest coast of America and from thence to the Japanese islands. Convinced of the importance of the undertaking, the government not only granted them an exclusive privilege for a period of five years but also procured on their behalf a license from the East India Company to trade within certain limits of their "territories". It was then discovered that the northwest coast of America lay within the region covered by the monopoly of the South Sea Company. As a result Richard Cadman Etches had to appear before the court of directors of the South Sea Company to seek a license from them also, since the company still retained "an exclusive right as from its institution (the Assiento Con-

[77] *Parliamentary History of England*, XXXII, 1287.

[78] Bundle of papers marked "Brig Catharine", F.O. 185, no. 14. In 1803 the seizure of this vessel on a charge of loitering and smuggling was reported.

[79] Brown, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXI, 662-78. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII, 178-84.

[80] Pares, pp. 517-33.

[81] 9 Anne c. 21.

tract excepted) to trade in the South Seas".[82] As the petition of Etches and Company was supported by "Lord Sydney, one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State", the court of directors granted the license for a five-year term.[83]

Proof of the continuing vitality of the South Sea Company's monopoly is furnished by the history of the whale fisheries' regulation in the years following this incident. In 1786 an act passed by parliament for the encouragement of whaling expressly stipulated that every ship intending to navigate within or frequent any part of the seas comprised in the boundaries of the exclusive trade of the South Sea Company must have a license from that company.[84] Nor was this act a "dead letter", for the records of the company in the succeeding years contain many instances of applications for new licenses or renewals and of the granting of such licenses.[85] In addition references are found to action taken against persons who were trading in the South Seas without such licenses, showing that the company was in no way forgetful of its rights.[86] In 1802 the privileges of the company were modified in that the waters of the Pacific Ocean were by act of parliament opened to fishing without license,[87] but this did not destroy the company's trading monopoly. Nor did the fact that the company had not

[82] Minute Books of the Court of Directors, South Sea Company Records, July 21, 1785, British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, 25521. For the use of this and the following material from the manuscript records of the South Sea Company cited below I am indebted to Mr. Armand Du Bois, author of a forthcoming publication, *The Shadow of the Bubble Act* (Commonwealth Fund). Mr. Du Bois generously turned over to me all his materials on this phase of the company's history.

[83] Minute Books, Aug. 4, 1785, Add. MSS., 25521. This incident is of particular interest because of its connection with the Nootka Sound controversy. *Cf.* Manning, A. H. A., *An. Rep.*, 1904, p. 296, n. C. Mr. Manning did not make use of the South Sea Company records. In 1791 Etches and Co. renewed their applications for a trading license with the support of Dundas, the Secretary of State, and the renewal was granted. Minute Books, Oct. 6, 1791, Add. MSS., 25523.

[84] 26 Geo. III c. 50, § xix; 28 Geo. III c. 20.

[85] Minute Books, May 4, 11, 1786, and Sept. and Dec., *passim*, Add. MSS., 25521. June 7, 1787, four more licenses granted; July, three granted; Aug., eight granted; Oct., two granted; Nov., three granted; Dec., one granted, Add. MSS., 25522. From this date on the flow of licenses continued, both applications and renewals being made. See the succeeding Minute Books: Add. MSS., 25523 (covers the period, Feb. 2, 1790-Jan. 24, 1793); Add. MSS., 25524 (Jan. 29, 1793-Jan. 28, 1796); Add. MSS., 25525 (Feb. 11, 1796-Jan. 24, 1799); Add. MSS., 25526 (Jan. 9, 1799-Jan. 25, 1802).

[86] Case of the ship *Queen Anne*, Minute Books, Mar., 1787, Add. MSS., 25522; case of the ship *Lightning*, July 10, 1795, *ibid.*, 25524; see also Committee of Law Suits, July 23, 1795, *ibid.*, 25572. Minute Books, July 23, 1795, *ibid.*, 25524.

[87] 42 Geo. III c. 77.

undertaken any commercial ventures for half a century impair the vitality of its rights, even though they seemed to have been forgotten.

Such was the state of affairs at the opening of the nineteenth century. Both English grant and Spanish restriction stood as barriers in the way of British individual enterprise in those regions. Although the Americans had been permitted access to the ports in South America (1797-99) and had since carried on some sporadic trade in the Rio de la Plata,[88] no relaxation of the Laws of the Indies had been authorized for the enemy British. Indeed, the first admission of British merchants to the Rio de la Plata was effected not by peaceful permission but through the unauthorized seizure of Buenos Aires by Sir John Popham and General Beresford in May, 1806. On June 28 and 30, 1806, Beresford issued orders opening the trade of Buenos Aires on the same terms as that of Trinidad; on August 4 he issued a proclamation further regulating duties.[89] This action was followed by the issuance of orders in council by the king on September 16, 1806, permitting trade between Great Britain and the lately conquered territory of the Rio de la Plata.[90] Ships with a value of one and a half million pounds sterling set out from England, eager in the race for the rich market so long closed to lawful entry.[91]

Scarcely were the vessels embarked on the high seas before the attention of the ministry was riveted on the fact that trade to the Rio de la Plata lay within the confines of the monopoly held by the South Sea Company. A nice question of law then arose. If the company's monopoly held good after conquest of the Rio de la Plata by English arms, then every ship that had departed for that region without a license from the directors of the company was embarked on an illegal venture and stood outside the protection of English insurance law. Owners of the ships and cargoes faced the ominous prospect of uncompensated loss should storm or disaster befall any vessel.[92]

[88] C. L. Chandler, "United States Merchant Ships in the Rio de la Plata (1801-1808)", *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, II (1919), 26-54. Samuel E. Morison, *Maritime History of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1921), pp. 181-82.

[89] Bernard Moses, *Spain's Declining Power, 1730-1806* (Berkeley, 1919), pp. 350-52.

[90] Judith Blow Williams, "The Establishment of British Commerce with Argentina", *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XV (1935), 47. Miss Williams treats but briefly the period of the opening of commerce, 1806-23, and does not appear to have used the materials in the Public Record Office cited below, the material cited above dealing with the South Sea Company, or the published material given below relating to the company's claims and position in 1806-7, save for reference to the acts of 1807 and 1815.

[91] Hansard, VIII, 995-96.

[92] *Ibid.* See also pp. 847-49.

Steps were immediately taken by the ministry to rectify this situation. Before the close of the year 1806 a bill was framed to secure the vessels already at sea and for the future give legal protection to trade to any part of South America obtained by the English, even though such land might lie within the monopoly of the South Sea Company. Consultations with the directors of the company ensued, some minor changes in accordance with their suggestions were made in the terms of the bill, and early in February, 1807, the bill was read in the House of Commons.[93] Against the bill was presented a petition of the directors claiming compensation for this infringement of privilege and requesting that they be allowed to appear by counsel.[94] A hot debate followed. On the one side, it was urged that the South Sea Company enjoyed a lawful monopoly and should be compensated on the ground that the company had not allowed their rights, both valuable and transferable, to lie dormant. Against this position it was urged that the South Sea Company had not for forty years carried on trade and could not benefit by this monopoly, which ran only to the territory under the dominion of the king of Spain. Lastly, the powerful argument was advanced that the property at stake was too valuable to risk. Unless parliament safeguarded these voyages, the underwriters would not be responsible in case of the loss of any vessel.[95] This consideration apparently carried the day, and a retroactive law was passed legalizing after September 17, 1806, and for the future, trade from the ports of Great Britain to any part of South America in the possession of the English crown.[96] Defeated on this issue, the directors of the South Sea Company could only resolve to continue their struggle for compensation, an object which they finally achieved in 1815.[97]

In the meantime the rising of the creoles against the British at Buenos Aires and the ignominious failure of the Whitlocke expedition wrested this new opportunity from the grasp of the British. With the British military evacuation of the region and with the restoration of Spanish authority in July, 1807, at Buenos Aires came also the reinstitution of the Laws of the Indies.[98] Once more Buenos Aires and Montevideo were barred to the lawful entry of foreign vessels.

[93] *Ibid.* For the text of the bill see *Parliamentary Papers,* 1806-7, I, no. 61.

[94] General Court of the South Sea Company, Feb. 15, 1807, Add. MSS., 25547. See also Hansard, VIII, 841-42.

[95] Hansard, VIII, 847-49, 995-97.

[96] 47 Geo. III, sess. i, c. 23.

[97] General Court, Feb., 1807, Feb. 9, 1815, and July 5, 1816, Add. MSS., 25547. See also Hansard, XXX, 157-58; 55 Geo. III c. 57.

[98] Williams, *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.,* XV, 49.

From this time on, however, British products and British vessels were never absent, in actual fact, from the Rio de la Plata region. This came about in various ways. From 1807 until November, 1809, we may say that a trade suffered but not recognized in law by the Spanish colonial authorities took place. Even at the moment of the withdrawal of the British troops, British merchants were permitted to remain in the city in order to dispose of their goods by special license from the new viceroy, Liniers.[99] During the two years that he remained in Buenos Aires a large volume of contraband trade developed, and the viceroy was reputed to have ever been "both publicly and privately most friendly" to the English merchants, although it was also charged that he connived at the smuggling operations in order to profit thereby himself.[100] Between November 1, 1808, and November 1, 1809, for example, thirty-one British vessels with cargoes valued at over one million pounds sterling arrived at Buenos Aires; during the same year ten British vessels with cargoes worth over five hundred thousand pounds reached Montevideo. Some of the vessels carried single cargoes of great value. The *Speedwell,* for instance, was stocked with goods valued at £200,000, the *Richard,* £125,000, and the *Kitty,* £100,000, although the majority of the ships, such as the *Mary Anne,* the *Spanish Hero,* and the *Antelope* ranged in value from ten to forty thousand pounds. All of this was landed by smuggling, so that the Spanish colonial authorities, by clinging to the formal restrictions of the law, lost a large amount of revenue.[101]

Conditions in Brazil probably contributed to this large volume of trade. The transfer of the Portuguese court to Rio de Janeiro under English convoy late in 1807 and the opening of the ports of Brazil to all friendly nations in January, 1808, had immensely increased trade to that country. This, in turn, undoubtedly facilitated smuggling thence as a *pied-à-terre* to the Rio de la Plata. Although the British did not secure the extraordinarily favorable treaty of commerce with Brazil until 1810, they did enjoy preferential port fees in the port of Rio de Janeiro as early as 1809 and thenceforth occupied there a posi-

[99] Memorial of Samuel Roberts, George Cadman, and others to Castlereagh, Feb. 3, 1814, F.O. 72/166. At this date Liniers was legally acting as military commander, but he was shortly after appointed viceroy as a reward for his services. Jules Richard, *Biographie de Jacques de Liniers* (Niort, n.d.), p. 25, and Le Marquis de Sassenay, *Napoléon Ier et la fondation de la République argentine* (Paris, 1892), pp. 78-79.

[100] William Dunn to Alex. Cunninghame, July 26, 1809; extract of a letter from Montevideo, Mar. 29, 1809, F.O. 72/90.

[101] Letter of Wm. Staples, Jan. 20, 1810, and enclosed accounts of British ships arrived at Buenos Aires and Montevideo, Nov. 1, 1808-Nov. 1, 1809, F.O. 72/157.

tion of increasing economic as well as political pre-eminence, a condition which without doubt facilitated the development of their interests in the Rio de la Plata.[102]

The standing of the trade during this period was, however, precarious. With the conclusion of peace between the Spanish patriots and England in 1808 a new situation arose. For a time fears were entertained by the British government lest all Spain succumb to the domination of Napoleon and his puppet king, Joseph. Castlereagh felt that in such event Great Britain must prevent the same thing befalling the Spanish colonies. Instructions to this effect were sent to Sir Sidney Smith, then resident at the Portuguese court in Rio de Janeiro.[103] At the same time a secret agent was dispatched to Buenos Aires in order to acquaint the Spanish colonials of the British alliance, stir up feeling against the French, and obtain information.[104]

Meantime the Spanish Junta had made plain their intention of maintaining the old Spanish colonial policy and even in the treaty of January, 1809, failed to relax commercial restrictions in favor of the British. Efforts were made, therefore, to persuade the local authorities themselves to make such concessions. Early in March, 1809, Sir Sidney Smith, the English adviser at Rio de Janeiro, wrote earnestly to Viceroy Liniers concerning this matter. Commercial treaties, he assured the viceroy, would be made by the central governments, and meantime, he suggested, the viceroy might follow the example of the governor of Havana and open the ports "for mutual convenience and regional benefit, raising revenue from a tolerated commerce". In particular he begged Liniers to withdraw his order forbidding British ships to approach Montevideo.[105]

By this date Liniers had apparently accorded permission to British vessels to enter the port of Buenos Aires,[106] but because of acute diffi-

[102] Alan K. Manchester, *British Pre-eminence in Brazil, its Rise and Decline: A Study in European Expansion* (Chapel Hill, 1933), pp. 54-71, 82-102. See also letters of Henry Hill, then American consul in Brazil, to the Secretary of State, especially Sept. 20, 1809, Feb. 28, 1810, July 2, 1813, May 8, 1814, Jan. 1, 1817, and Mar. 26, 1818, Dept. St., Consular Letters, San Salvador, vol. I, pt. 1, vol. II, pt. 1.

[103] Castlereagh to Smith, Aug. 4, 1808, F.O. 72/91. Sir Sidney Smith was in November appointed chief of the naval forces in Brazil, and captains in the captaincies were instructed to support him with troops, militia, etc. See circular of the Brazilian government in the name of the prince regent, Nov. 2, 1808, enclosed in a letter of Smith, Feb. 26, 1809, *ibid.*

[104] Castlereagh to Major Burke, Aug. 4, 1808, *ibid.*

[105] Smith to Liniers, Mar. 18, 1809, F.O. 72/91.

[106] Williams, *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XV, 50, n. 61, citing B.T. 6/32, says that Liniers opened the trade in 1808 and cites in support of this statement a report of mer-

culties with Governor Elio he refused a like privilege to Montevideo for a time.[107] By June, 1809, British vessels were entering Montevideo also, but the fees and duties exacted at that port (over thirty per cent ad valorem of the value of the cargo plus port fees) rendered such trade unprofitable.[108] The deposition of Liniers and the arrival of the new viceroy, Cisneros, in June, 1809, created new uncertainty as to the status of British trade. It was reported that all ports would be closed despite the opposition of the inhabitants.[109] It was known that the new viceroy had orders to put the Laws of the Indies in force; moreover, he openly expressed his disapprobation of the contraband trade that had been carried on at Buenos Aires, and rumors were widespread concerning the steps he was taking to keep all foreign boats out of the river.[110] The creoles urgently demanded that the ports be opened to British shipping; opposed to this measure were the natives of Old Spain, who, as agents for the privileged companies at Cadiz, carried on smuggling and thereby reaped fortunes. A factor further complicating the situation was the need of the Buenos Aires treasury for revenue: public permission of the British trade would turn into the public coffers the large profits collected by the smugglers. In September, 1809, the Old Spanish merchants even arranged a loan of one million dollars to the government in order to keep the ports closed. By November, however, the tide of popular indignation against the maintenance of restrictions coupled with the viceroy's need for revenue proved too strong for the Old Spanish merchants. On November 2 a decree was issued by the viceroy recapitulating the colonial laws of Spain but adding that no peaceable British merchant would be

chants of July 29, 1824. The evidence of the letters of 1809 indicates that Liniers permitted British vessels to enter the river and tolerated a trade but does not support the idea of a formal opening of the trade as early as this.

[107] The struggle between Elio and Liniers began in September, 1808, culminating in the attempted overthrow of Liniers in January, 1809. Elio represented the Old Spaniards, Liniers the Creole party. Liniers was suspect because of his French nationality. See Sassenay, pp. 163-78. Elio later became involved in the controversy over the claims of the princess of Brazil. See Smith to Liniers, Mar. 18, 1809, F.O. 72/91. See also Castlereagh to Smith (copy undated), *ibid.*, warning him that no Englishman could interfere in the delicate question of the rights of succession to the Spanish throne or the rights of the regency. Castlereagh refused therefore to submit to the king the princess's letter and returned it to Smith.

[108] Alexander McKinnon to Geo. Hammond, June 11, 1809; copy of a letter of McKinnon to Elio, June 24, 1809, F.O. 72/90.

[109] Wm. Dunn to Cunninghame, July 15, 1809, F.O. 72/90. Liniers's removal was secured by Elio and the Montevideo party and represented the triumph of the Old Spaniards. Sassenay, pp. 177-79.

[110] Dunn to Cunninghame, July 26, 1809, F.O. 72/90.

molested. A few days later, on November 6, the junta of Buenos Aires publicly opened the trade of that port to the British.[111]

This marks an important step in the story of the development of British trade to that region, although the decree was not, in actuality, definitive. In December, 1809, in accordance with the orders of the Spanish government, all ports were to be closed;[112] in 1810 Cisneros warned the British merchants that they must leave within a brief time.[113] This threat caused renewed uncertainty and gave an impetus to the surge of revolutionary feeling in Buenos Aires against the Spanish government. In May of that year the junta of Buenos Aires deposed Cisneros and opened the port to the commerce of all nations.[114] From this time until the definitive recognition of Buenos Aires by the British government the commerce of the British there rested on the freedom of trading relations accorded by the revolutionary leaders.

During the years immediately after the definitive opening of commerce certain impediments existed to the fullest development of trade potentialities in the Rio de la Plata. In the first place, internal discords impeded commerce. In 1810 the Regency of Spain appointed Governor Elio of Montevideo as viceroy in Cisneros's place. As the junta of Buenos Aires refused to recognize his authority, the new viceroy opened hostilities against that place. Claiming the support of the neighboring Portuguese, Elio blockaded Buenos Aires despite the protests of the British; not until October, 1811, was a temporary peace concluded.[115] Since the inhabitants of Buenos Aires rightly regarded the Portuguese as being dominated by British influence, they blamed the British for their difficulties with Elio and the aggressions of the Portuguese, thus causing the British to lose popular favor. Moreover, the failure of the British government to respond to the overtures of the

[111] McKinnon to Canning, Sept. 9, 29, Nov. 2, Dec. 6, 1809, F.O. 72/90. For the text of the decree see *Documentos para la historia argentina,* VII, 379-85.

[112] John Barrow to Wm. Hamilton, Dec. 22, 1809, F.O. 72/90.

[113] McKinnon to the Secretary of State, Aug. 12, 1810, F.O. 72/107.

[114] Sassenay, pp. 216-19. See also *American State Papers, Foreign Relations,* IV, 328.

[115] Elio permitted British merchant vessels to enter Montevideo but declared a rigorous blockade of Buenos Aires because it was in rebellion. The British had stationed a naval vessel at the Rio de la Plata to protect their commerce. See R. Elliot to the vice admiral, Mar. 2, 1811; Elliot to Elio, Feb. 7, 1811; Elio to Elliot, Feb. 9, 10, 1811; Elliot to Elio, Feb. 23, 27, 1811; Elio to Elliot, Feb. 28, 1811; Elliot to Elio, Mar. 1, 1811, and undated reply of Elio to Elliot, Great Britain, Navy Papers, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress, Washington. See also Staples's Narrative of Events at Buenos Aires [1812 ?], F.O. 72/157. F. A. Kirkpatrick, *A History of the Argentine Republic* (Cambridge, 1931), pp. 84-89.

revolutionary leaders and its refusal to intervene in behalf of the independence of Buenos Aires angered the group in control there and to some extent exercised a deleterious influence on the growth of British trade.[116]

From 1812 onward several generalizations hold true as to the position of the British at Buenos Aires. In the first place, it is evident that their trade to that region was valuable and far outstripped that of the Americans. In the first six months of the year 1812 only seven American ships entered Buenos Aires, while during the year the exports of British goods to that place totaled £404,220, 6*s*., 4*d*.[117] In the last six months of 1814 not a single vessel from the United States entered that port, although British cargoes valued at £458,152, 8*s*., 10*d* were shipped to that place in the same year.[118] Not indeed until the close of the War of 1812 did American trade to Buenos Aires assume any importance.[119] It would be tedious to recapitulate the quantities of goods shipped annually by the British in the years following the conclusion of peace. Clearly, however, the British export statistics indicate a large and firmly established volume of trade, varying somewhat in amount but averaging about four hundred thousand pounds sterling annually.[120] In 1816-17, for instance, seventy-eight British vessels arrived; in the following year eighty-four came in, an increase of nearly three thousand tons of shipping in one year.[121] By 1821 John Forbes, the American consul at Buenos Aires, could write despondently to his Secretary of State that the most valuable import trade was entirely in the hands of the British merchants.[122]

Secondly, it is clear that the British government appreciated the importance of this trade and evidenced a lively interest in it. Throughout the negotiations for mediation between Spain and her colonies in

[116] Rivadavia to Staples, Apr. 1, 1812; Staples's Narrative, F.O. 72/157. In 1810 the value of British property in the Rio de la Plata "was seldom less than £750,000". McKinnon to the Secretary of State, Aug. 12, 1810, F.O 72/107.

[117] W. S. Miller to the Secretary of State, July 6, 1812, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Buenos Aires, vol. I, pt. 1. *British and Foreign State Papers*, IV, 571.

[118] T. L. Halsey to the Secretary of State, Feb. 11, 1815, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Buenos Aires, vol. I, pt. 1. *British and Foreign State Papers*, IV, 571.

[119] John Zimmermann to the Secretary of State, Dec. 31, 1820, "Report on United States Trade in the River Plata", Dept. St., Consular Letters, Buenos Aires, vol. I, pt. 2.

[120] E. J. Pratt, "Anglo-American Commercial and Political Rivalry on the Plata, 1820-30", *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, XI (1931), 304-5. *British and Foreign State Papers*, IV, 571, VII, 870-71, XI, 902-3.

[121] Enclosures no. 1 and no. 2 in Staples to W. Hamilton, Oct. 12, 1818, F.O. 72/215.

[122] Apr. 1, 1821, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Buenos Aires, vol. I, pt. 2.

1811-12 and in 1817 the British ministry adhered to one essential condition—that the ports of Spanish America should be opened to greater freedom of commerce. Indeed their whole policy of nonintervention pivoted on this one point. Special privileges for British commerce they abstained from asking, but they refused to undertake even a peaceful mediation unless Spain would grant the freedom of commerce she still denied her colonies in law.[123]

Nor is the stand of the British ministry surprising in view of the strength of the interest shown by British merchants in that trade. As early as 1809 a long memorandum on the advantages to Great Britain of the Spanish American trade was sent to the ministry, complaining of the enterprise of the Americans and begging the government to take steps lest other rivals "snatch the golden opportunity". Another argument was that the need for new markets, where British manufacturers could recoup their losses, made British action toward South America imperative. The freeing of South America by British arms would not only aid British commerce but would stimulate the British whaling industry, wrote another memorialist.[124] In March, 1812, McKinnon, a British merchant at Buenos Aires, submitted a long memorandum on the subject to Lord Castlereagh. The Americans, he claimed, were building up a feeling favorable to the United States by promising "arms and emancipation (from the Jaws of the Lion to be devoured by the Tiger)". In particular the mission of Joel R. Poinsett and his activities in Chile aroused apprehension lest the Americans gain superior advantages. As consul general at Buenos Aires, Poinsett spread political poison, said McKinnon.[125] Staples, whose position is explained below, declared that Poinsett had been "particularly assiduous" in endeavoring to increase suspicion of the British at Buenos Aires,[126]

[123] For the proposed mediation of 1811-12 see C. K. Webster, *The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1812-1815* (London, 1931), pp. 70-72. In addition to the references Webster cites (which consist largely of the correspondence between Wellesley and Wellington) see also the following interesting material: Nohaker (Admiralty Office) to Hamilton, Oct. 11, 1811; Admiralty Office to Hamilton, Oct. 5, 1811; Royal Instructions to Commissioners by George IV, Aug. 2, 1812; Memoranda of Geo. Cockburn, Aug. 11, 1812, F.O. 72/156. See also Castlereagh's exposition of the Memoranda and Instructions relating to the Mission of 1812 in F.O. 72/204. For the mediation mission of 1817 see Webster, *The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822* (London, 1925), pp. 413-14.

[124] Memoranda (unsigned) communicated by C. Stuart, Nov. 15, 1809; communication from Wm. Johnston [1809 ?]; memorial of the advantages to be obtained by Great Britain from an intercourse with Spanish America, William Jacob [1810 ?], F.O. 72/90.

[125] McKinnon to Castlereagh, Mar. 31, 1812, F.O. 72/157.

[126] Staples to Castlereagh, July 30, 1812, F.O. 72/157.

while Captain Bowles of the British navy informed the Lords of the Admiralty that Poinsett might be considered as much in the interests of France as in those of America.[127] One group of merchants in Buenos Aires begged the British to take steps to check the growing ascendancy of "active and designing Rivals (the Americans)"; another group declared that "the United States cannot rise in the scale of favour without British interests sinking in the same proportions".[128] It is small wonder that Cockburn, one of the British commissioners in the mediation of 1812, drew up a long memorandum for his government after the failure of the mission, urging that Great Britain take other steps to secure trade concessions in Spanish America lest a dangerous connection be formed between New Spain and the United States.[129]

Proof of the active interest of the British government in the trade to Buenos Aires is shown by the designation of Robert Staples as "consul" in 1811.[130] At first the Buenos Aires government refused to accept him, claiming that "his diploma was not accompanied by the proper documents" and that the English ministry had not replied to letters from the Buenos Aires government.[131] Staples thereupon returned to England but was once more in Buenos Aires in 1813. For some years thereafter he remained in that city, watchful of British interests and fearful of the designs of the United States and her citizens.[132] Staples's status is characteristic of British commercial diplomacy. At Buenos Aires he was publicly acknowledged from 1816 on by merchants and patriot government as consul, but the home authorities, while continuing him as "agent", refused him a consular patent on the technical ground that the Spanish government had denied him an exequatur.[133] Nevertheless Staples sans title continued to function as consul.

During the same period the British were also attempting to secure access to the ports of the west coast of South America. As was stated

[127] Nov. 9, 1811 (copy), F.O. 72/166.

[128] Memorial of British Merchants, July 2, 1812; Second Address of British Merchants, Aug. 21, 1812, F.O. 72/157.

[129] Memoranda and letter of Cockburn to ————, Aug. 11, 1812, F.O. 72/156.

[130] Staples to Rivadavia, Mar. 28, 1812, F.O. 72/157. See also F.O. 72/126 for the appointment; the term "consul" was loosely used.

[131] Rivadavia to Staples, Apr. 1, 1812, F.O. 72/157.

[132] Staples to Rivadavia, Apr. 2, 1812; Staples to Hamilton, Nov. 18, Dec. 11, 1813, Jan. 29, May 8, Aug. 10, 1814, F.O. 72/157, 171.

[133] Resolutions of the British Merchants at Buenos Aires, July 29, 1816, F.O. 72/189; Staples to Castlereagh, Oct. 2, 1818, F.O. 72/215; Hamilton to Staples, Jan. 5, 1819, Staples to Hamilton, May 14, 1819, F.O. 72/227.

above, under the cloak of the whaling privileges granted by the Nootka Sound Convention some contraband trade existed even before 1796. In the early years of the nineteenth century, during the period of war between Spain and Great Britain, a licensed trade developed from the ports of Great Britain, a trade reputedly "connived at by the Spanish colonial authorities and authorized by the English king" in order to relieve the severe distress of the manufacturers of Britain.[134] In 1807-8 twelve ships, armed with guns and fortified by license from his Britannic majesty, cleared from British ports with the double object of smuggling goods into Chile and Peru and of preying on Spanish commerce. The value of the individual cargoes varied from £60,000 to £130,000. In all, they totaled the tidy sum of over nine hundred thousand pounds.[135] One enterprising firm of merchants secured licenses from both the English and Spanish kings to take produce from those regions back to England, an arrangement that well illustrates the expedients to which the traders of both countries were forced to resort.[136]

The declaration of peace between Spain and England in 1808 produced no amelioration of trade restrictions along the coasts of Chile and Peru. Indeed, the Spanish colonial authorities increased the strictness of their enforcement of the Laws of the Indies and exhibited great severity. Seizures of British vessels were made at Valparaiso; the authorities of Peru and Chile threatened grimly with armed privateers any British vessels found in the Spanish ports of the Pacific Ocean or coming within ten leagues of the coast.[137] Not until the rise of revolutionary movements were the ports of the west coast opened—in Chile in 1811 and in Peru at a later date.

Information on the operations on the west coast is fragmentary. Some time in 1811 the revolutionary leaders of Chile declared the ports of Talcahuano, Valparaiso, and Coquimbo open to all nations.[138] But the grim reconquest of Chile in 1814 by the viceroy of Peru once more

[134] Petition of Merchants to Canning, Aug. 3, 1809, F.O. 72/90. Abstract of judicial proceedings in the case of the ship *Scorpion* at Santiago de Chile, Oct. 29, 1808, *ibid.*

[135] Account of ships cleared from Great Britain destined to trade with the coasts of Chile and Peru during winter of 1807 and the year 1808, F.O. 72/90.

[136] Gorman Brothers to Bathurst, Nov. 14, 1809, F.O. 72/90.

[137] McKinnon to Hammond, June 11, 1809; petition of merchants to Canning, Aug. 3, 1809; Ant. Garcia Canasia, Capt. General of Chile to the Viceroy of Buenos Aires, Oct. 8, 1808; abstract of judicial proceedings in the case of the ship *Scorpion,* Oct. 29, 1808, F.O. 72/90.

[138] *American State Papers, Foreign Relations,* IV, 301. Robertson, p. 188, gives the date for the opening as February 21, 1811.

closed the ports of that country to free commerce. Not until the victories of San Martín, aided later by Thomas Cochrane, had in 1818 destroyed Spanish control of Chile could the ports be permanently opened.[139] Immediately after the patriots' occupation of Santiago British trade commenced to flourish, and the need of a vice consul to protect the interests of British merchants was mooted.[140] Between May, 1817, and June, 1818, for example, twenty British vessels entered Valparaiso; during the last six months of 1818, after the patriots' victory, as many British ships again came into that port, far exceeding the number of American vessels.[141] Records of American commerce in these years give some idea of the type of cargo carried. Wheat and copper were the main exports; dry goods, china goods, hardware, and arms, the main imports. In addition numerous whaling vessels frequented the Chilean ports for refitting and supplies.[142]

Difficulties were experienced by the British and American traders in the Pacific because of the warfare between the Chilean patriots and the viceroy of Peru. Although Spain laid no formal blockade on the ports of the revolted provinces, she continued to deny all foreign vessels access to any ports in those regions, and Spanish armed vessels operating from the loyal city of Lima seized neutral vessels along these coasts. The Chilean navy, under the command of Lord Cochrane, retaliated and in 1819 declared a blockade of Peruvian ports.[143] According to the American agents on the west coast of South America, Lord Cochrane treated English merchant vessels with greater consideration than was accorded to ships from the United States.[144] This is not implausible, for as early as 1817 General San Martín was negotiating with England for an alliance and even held out promises of advantageous political and commercial treaties in return for British aid to

[139] W. R. Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States concerning the Independence of the Latin American Nations* (New York, 1925-), II, p. 984. *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, IV, 301, 308.

[140] Staples to Hamilton, June 12, 1818, F.O. 72/215.

[141] Henry Hill (of New York) to the Secretary of State, June 30, Dec. 31, 1818, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Valparaiso, vol. I.

[142] M. A. Haevels to the Secretary of State, Mar. 16, 1812; Hill to the Secretary, June 30, 1818, and enclosure no. 2; same to same, Dec. 31, 1818, *ibid.*

[143] Hill to the Secretary of State, May 15, Sept. 28, 1819, Apr. 8, 1820, *ibid.* Jeremy Robinson to the Secretary, Aug. 9, 12, Dec. 6, 1818, Dept. St., Special Agents Letters. Same to the Secertary, Oct. 4, 1818, Jeremy Robinson Papers, Box II, Library of Congress. See *Niles' Register*, XVI, 318, for the text of the blockade.

[144] Hill to the Secretary of State, Apr. 8, 1820, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Valparaiso, vol. I. Jeremy Robinson to the Secretary, Aug. 12, 1818, *ibid.*, Special Agents Letters.

Chile in her struggle for independence.[145] In 1820 it was reported that several large commercial houses in England had fitted out a commercial expedition in co-operation with Lord Cochrane for the purpose of monopolizing the trade of the Pacific, and that other vessels had sailed from England to Chile in that year with cargoes amounting to half a million dollars. In the six months before June, 1820, twenty-four British vessels entered the port of Valparaiso and but ten American.[146] Here, as in other parts of South America, a growing rivalry was springing up between British and American traders.

Meantime the viceroy of Peru stubbornly clung, in theory at least, to the old Spanish laws. For a longer period, indeed, than elsewhere in South America, Peru remained a stronghold of Spanish authority. By 1818, however, rumors of a contraband trade were widespread. British vessels were reported to have entered Callao, and although they were not permitted to trade or land their cargoes openly, clandestine disposal of their goods was permitted.[147] English vessels, complained the American agent, were given kindlier treatment than those of the United States.[148] But in law the restrictions of the Spanish decrees were still maintained. Peru remained "a mere Spanish colony, subject to the severest colonial rule recorded in the annals of legislation. . . . In this colony in fine, as well as in others of the same nation, if any foreign vessel arrived, it might be deemed lost, together with the merchandise which it might have on board."[149]

Yet even in Peru cracks in the authority of the Laws of the Indies widened from 1818 on, owing to the needs of the treasury of Peru, its resources strained by the expenses incurred in the war against the patriots of Chile. In 1818 it was rumored that the viceroy even favored a free commerce, but although the opening of the ports was agitated the measure was negatived. In 1819 the need for revenue in order to carry on the war against Chile became pressing. Permission to trade

[145] San Martín to the Earl of Fife, Dec. 9, 1817, F.O. 72/202. Staples to Hamilton, May 25, 1817, F.O. 72/202. Bernardo O'Higgins to his royal highness, Nov. 20, 1817, transmitted by José de San Martín to Castlereagh, Jan. 12, 1818; San Martín to Castlereagh, Apr. 11, 1818, F.O. 72/215.

[146] Michael Hogan to the Secretary of State, Feb. 2, 1820; Hill to the Secretary, June 30, 1820, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Valparaiso, vol. I.

[147] Robinson to the Secretary of State, Aug. 12, Dec. 6, 1818, Dept. St., Special Agents Letters. Hill to the Secretary, June 30, Dec. 31, 1818, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Valparaiso, vol. I.

[148] Robinson to the Secretary of State, Aug. 12, 1818, Dept. St., Special Agents Letters.

[149] *Senate Executive Documents*, 35 Cong., 1 sess., XIII, no. 58, pp. 335-36.

covertly in the ports by royal license was granted by the viceroy. In the same year, also, a contract was made by the viceroy with a firm of Spanish merchants whereby they advanced to him $200,000—$50,000 as a donation and $150,000 on account of the customs duties. In return the Arismendi firm secured the right to employ one or two ships of any country they chose to bring in cargoes from China, an arrangement to which the viceroy resorted because of his great need for revenue.[150] Finally, in the same year, the viceroy issued an order opening the port of Callao to British trade for a period of two years. Englishmen might settle in the port and trade there, but only through the agency of a Spanish consignee could they dispose of their goods. Ad valorem duties were set at 30 per cent; export duties ranged from 7 per cent on silver and 8 per cent on gold to 3 per cent on all other exports.[151]

For a time, therefore, British merchants alone enjoyed lawful access to Callao. In 1820, however, the viceroy, pressed anew by the difficulties of the war against Chile, opened Callao to all neutral vessels except such as carried the products of Chile. At that date, it was reported, 50 or 60 British ships were trading on the Pacific coast (this included the northwest coast and the Pacific islands), and 80 British whalers were in that region; at the same date the Americans had approximately 40 merchantmen and 150 whalers there.[152] In 1821 it was reported that from March of that year all the ports of South America were opened to foreign vessels coming direct with the products of their own countries.[153] Although the cortes delayed any action of this kind in June of that year, the conquest of Peru by San Martín and the declaration of the independence of that country rendered illusory the claims of the Spanish government.[154] When, in 1824, the Spanish king finally decreed freedom of commerce for the ports of his colonies, he was legislating for a region that had already repudiated his authority and established freedom of commerce.[155]

Thus, bit by bit, breaches had been made in the not too solid walls of the Laws of the Indies. In each colony the steps by which the

[150] Robinson to the Secretary of State, Aug. 12, 1818, Jan. 17, 1820, Dept. St., Special Agents Letters. *Sen. Exec. Doc.*, 35 Cong., 1 sess., XIII, no. 58, pp. 138, 153-55.

[151] P. C. Tupper to Castlereagh, Mar. 20, 1819, F.O. 72/227.

[152] Robinson to the Secretary of State, Oct. 2, 1820, Jeremy Robinson Letters, Box II.

[153] Extract of letter from Michael Hogan, Jan. 21, 1821, Dept. St., Consular Letters, Valparaiso, vol. I.

[154] *British and Foreign State Papers*, VIII, 1270-73; IX, 393, 400-403, 759-66.

[155] *Ibid.*, XI, 864. For the opening of commerce see Robertson, p. 191.

British gained entrance to the ports evidence a great similarity—from the first stage of a contraband trade to that of a trade connived at, albeit disapproved, by the authorities, then to a commerce permitted in desperation by the local government because of its need for money, and finally to the status of a trade opened by revolutionary edict. In the case of Cuba the final step was taken by the Spanish government; elsewhere it appears that the triumph of revolution sealed with approval a condition already existing to some degree. A survey of these critical years shows the concomitant formal maintenance but slow crumbling of Spanish authority, defeated by the changing conditions effected by the Napoleonic period. "I called a new world into existence", boasted Canning; but his claim to fame rests on the recognition and not the creation of a new condition. To the British merchants, rather, and to their American rivals, belongs the credit for shaping the circumstances that called forth Canning's boast on the one side of the Atlantic and the Monroe Doctrine on the other.

Dorothy Burne Goebel.

Hunter College.

DOCUMENTS

"War Guilt" in France and Germany

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY A COMMITTEE OF FRENCH AND GERMAN HISTORIANS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEXTBOOKS IN BOTH COUNTRIES

A good deal has been heard since the close of the Great War about the chauvinistic tendencies of historical textbooks in certain countries. In 1925 the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation of the League of Nations established an official procedure for making and receiving complaints on this subject, but little advantage has been taken of it. Then the International Conference on the Teaching of History, which met at The Hague in 1932 and at Basel in 1934, interested itself in the matter, only to see its *Bulletin* disappear after two issues. So it has been left for certain French and German historians to take some practical steps looking towards the elimination from the textbooks of their respective countries of the more obvious objectionable features. Collective security has been replaced, as it were, by a regional agreement.

As a result of German initiative a meeting was held in Paris in November, 1935, this having been preceded by exchanges in writing of critiques of many historical textbooks.[1] Those present, on the German side, were Paul Herre, formerly professor in the University of Leipzig and later director of the Reichsarchiv, and Arnold Reimann, president of the Historische Gesellschaft zu Berlin and of the Verband deutscher Geschichtslehrer;[2] and, on the French side, Gustave Morizet, president of the Association des professeurs d'histoire et de géographie, Jules Isaac, inspector general of public instruction, Paul Mantoux, professor at the Conservatoire des arts et métiers and at the Institut universitaire des hautes études internationales (Geneva), Georges Pagès, professor in the University of Paris, member of the Institute, Pierre Renouvin, professor in the University of Paris, Weill-Raynal, professor agrégé, and Georges Lapierre, secretary of the Syndicat national des instituteurs and of the

[1] On the German side, R. Hain, *Deutschland im Lichte französischer Geschichtsbücher für den Schulunterricht* (Berlin, 1935). On the French side, five reports prepared *ad hoc* by French members of the Committee; see also J. Isaac, "L'histoire des origines de la guerre dans les manuels allemands", *Revue d'histoire de la guerre mondiale*, X (1932), 25-52.

[2] A larger German delegation, six in all, was originally contemplated; the reduction was caused, it is said, by the difficulty of obtaining foreign exchange.

Fédération internationale des associations d'instituteurs. Louis Fouret, member of the Conseil supérieur de l'instruction publique, served as interpreter. After the meeting the French and German texts of the resolutions agreed upon were compared and harmonized by correspondence.

It was originally planned to publish the resolutions in France and Germany in June, 1936, but because of the political tension resulting from the German reoccupation of the Rhineland in March, 1936, publication was postponed, at the request of the German members of the Committee, until the general atmosphere was more favorable. It was finally agreed that the resolutions should be released on May 15, 1937. In France they appeared in *L'enseignement public,* in the *Bulletin de la Société des professeurs d'histoire et de géographie,* in *L'école libératrice* (the organ of the Syndicat national des instituteurs, with a circulation of 100,000 copies), and in other publications.

In Germany the resolutions were supposed to appear in *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* and in the *Reichszeitung deutscher Erzieher,* the organ of the Deutscher Erzieherbund. Actually, when the time came, *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* refused to publish them,[3] and the *Reichszeitung deutscher Erzieher* did not do so. The resolutions did, however, appear in the *Nationalsozialistische Erziehung* for May 8, 1937, with an introduction by Reimann and Herre, who loyally appealed to their colleagues in Germany to continue the work thus happily begun.[4] But on June 12, 1937, the same periodical denied that the German members of the Committee had authority to make a binding engagement and declared that the resolutions constituted only a "first step" which might serve as a basis for future discussion. This is interpreted in France as a disavowal of the German delegation by their government.

In spite of this untoward ending, the resolutions are of great interest. French and German historians have succeeded to an astonishing degree in reaching an agreement on many disputed points in the history of Franco-German relations since the Treaty of Westphalia. Those familiar with the numerous controversies concerning the crisis of July, 1914, will appreciate keenly the concessions made by each side. An important step in the right direction has surely been taken.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

The University of Chicago.

[3] In its issue for September, 1937, this journal published a sharp critique of the resolutions by Dr. Wilhelm Ziegler.

[4] According to *Das neue Tagebuch* (Paris, seemingly an organ of German refugees), August 7, 1937 (vol. V, no. 32, pp. 751-52), the resolutions appeared only in the edition for "Gau Berlin". The translator has, however, seen the text in the edition for "Gau Osthannover". Whether it was published throughout Germany is not clear.

PREAMBLE

Certain French and German historians met in Paris from November 25 to December 1, 1935, to examine the corrections which it would be desirable to make in the schoolbooks of the two countries in order to harmonize them with the results of scientific research.

The German members declared that they represented the Historische Gesellschaft zu Berlin and the Verband deutscher Geschichtslehrer and that they were acting with the knowledge of [5] their government.

The French members declared that they had been chosen only by the Association des professeurs d'histoire. They had asked a qualified representative of primary education to co-operate. In April, 1937, they informed the French ministry of education of their initiative.

The points on which the French and German members have recorded their agreement, as well as those on which their views are divergent, are formulated as follows:

I

The Committee is in agreement in recognizing that before 1789 the kings of France did not pursue a policy of "natural frontiers" directed particularly towards the Rhine; the policy of "natural frontiers" was, before the French Revolution, the conception of certain political theorists; the kings of France pursued a policy of territorial expansion in all directions; that policy was in conformity with the practices of all princes in all countries at that time; the idea of nationality did not play an active role in the policy of rulers.

The difference of opinion which continues to exist between French and German professors results from their different conception of the role played during this period, consciously or unconsciously, by the feeling of nationality (*l'instinct ou la conscience de la nationalité; das völkische Gefühl bewusst oder unbewusst*).

The German members, for example, believe that the conquests of Frederick II took place on territory of German nationality and that consequently they were of a different nature from those of Louis XIV.

The French members are of the opinion that this distinction has no justification from a historical point of view.

II

The German members recognize as well founded the observation of the French members that the peaceful European policy of Vergennes under Louis XVI, which was the last important expression (*manifestation; Ausdruck*) of the policy of the French monarchy under the *ancien régime*, is hardly referred to in the German textbooks.

III

The Committee is in agreement in stating that French policy during the Revolution passed through the three following phases:

1. A very short period dominated by the desire to spread the ideas of the Revolution, for example, the union (*rattachement; Wiederangliederung*) of Avignon [with France].

2. A period of conquering Belgium and the left bank of the Rhine, which French statesmen tried to justify by the theory of "natural frontiers".

3. The policy of Bonaparte, which became a personal policy and was no longer confined to the so-called "natural frontiers".

[5] The original wording was "in agreement with" but was changed subsequently at the request of the German delegation.

The Committee likewise points out that the French Revolution introduced a new principle—the right of peoples to dispose of themselves (plebiscites)—whatever may have been the practical application of it.[6]

IV

The Committee is in agreement in noting a state of mind that was generally peaceful (*un esprit pacifique général; ein Geist friedlichen Entgegenkommens*) in the relations between the governments in France and in Germany from 1815 to the Italian war of 1859; the crisis of 1840 was primarily, on both sides, an ebullition (*mouvement; Aufwallen*) of public opinion.

V

The Committee is in agreement in stating that Alsace, a land of German speech and culture in the Middle Ages and at the time of the Reformation, preserved its peculiarities of speech and, in great measure, of culture as well after 1648; but that as a result of the Revolution of 1789 it was fully absorbed in the national body politic of France (*la Révolution de 1789 l'a fait entrer complètement dans la Communauté nationale française; dass aber die Revolution von 1789 es vollkommen in die nationale französische Lebensgemeinschaft hat eintreten lassen*).

They are in agreement in recognizing that it would be important to modify the treatment of the question of Alsace-Lorraine in the textbooks.

It would be indispensable that

1. German historical teaching should explain to pupils the French point of view as well as the German; it should cease to describe Alsace-Lorraine as "purely German territory" (*"rein deutsches Gebiet"*); it should mention the protest of the deputies of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, which was confirmed by the continuing agitation of protest (*le long mouvement protestataire; die lange Protestbewegung*).[7]

2. The French textbooks, on their side, should indicate the reasons why in 1871 Germans regarded the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine as a legitimate proceeding, except for French-speaking Lorraine, which was annexed, on their own admission, for strategic reasons.

VI

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that the famous words of Bismarck, *"Macht geht vor Recht"* (Might goes before right), were not uttered by him, but that they constitute the résumé, made by a political opponent,[8] of a thesis put forward by Bismarck on a question of internal policy concerning the relations between the executive and the legislative power in case of conflict.

Nevertheless, it may also be recalled that when he came to power in 1862, Bismarck said, with reference to the German question: "The great questions of the time will not be decided by speeches and resolutions of majorities—that was the mistake of 1848 and 1849—but by blood and iron".

[6] A reference, presumably, to the fact that the plebiscites conducted by the French in the territories taken by them were notoriously manipulated by them in order to secure the results desired.

[7] Not abandoned until 1887.

[8] Count von Schwerin, speaking in the Prussian Landtag.

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating furthermore that Bismarck wished to resort to war only in so far as he deemed this necessary to break down the obstacles which might stand in the way of the creation of German unity.

VII

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating, in respect of the question of the Duchies, that the policy of Bismarck resulted in Prussia's annexing regions the population of which was for the major part German and not Danish.

But they cannot reach an agreement on the following point:

The German members assert that if the plebiscite for Northern Schleswig never took place, it was solely because Denmark was not willing to fulfill the necessary preliminary conditions.

The French members are unable to formulate an opinion on this matter without having knowledge of the documents to which the German members refer.[9]

VIII

On the interpretation of the policy of Napoleon III, the members of the Committee accept the view of this policy which is expressed in the work of Johannes Haller, *Tausend Jahre deutsch-französischer Beziehungen* (1930), p. 124: "It would be labor lost (*Verlorene Mühe*) to look for a firm plan in the policy of Napoleon III towards Germany or even for a steady *arrière-pensée*. It was not his plan to prevent German unity, and just as little to promote it".

The members of the Committee are in agreement in indicating (*indiquer; Feststellung*) that Napoleon III regarded the plans of Bismarck as disquieting, but that Bismarck, for his part, regarded the attitude of the French government as disquieting (*inquiétante; beunruhigend*). This mutual fear appears to be an important fact which the textbooks of the two countries should take into account.

As regards the immediate origins of the war of 1870, the Committee is in agreement in stating that as a result of the steps (*initiatives; Handlungen*) taken by Napoleon III and Bismarck in the days immediately preceding the conflict—French demand (*demande; Forderung*) for guarantees, Ems dispatch, steps which, however, were clearly and fully known only after the war—the French and German peoples went to war against each other, each convinced that it had been challenged (*provoqués; herausgefordert*).

[9] Article V of the Treaty of Prague, which ended the Austro-Prussian war of 1866, provided for the cession of Schleswig by Austria to Prussia with the reservation that "the populations of Northern Schleswig shall be again united with Denmark in the event of their expressing a desire so to do by a vote freely exercised". It is usually said that Prussia made no effort to put the article into effect because Bismarck maintained that as Prussian subjects, the people of Northern Schleswig had no right to demand a plebiscite and that only the Emperor of Austria could do so. In 1878 the article was abrogated by agreement with Austria. The documents referred to by the Committee may possibly be (the translator has not read them) *Bismarck und die nordschleswigsche Frage: Die diplomatische Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes zur Geschichte des Artikels V des Prager Friedens* (Berlin, 1925) and *Ursprung und Geschichte des Artikels V des Prager Friedens: Die deutschen Akten zur Frage der Teilung Schleswigs, 1863-79* (2 vols., Breslau, 1929).

RESERVATIONS:

But there is disagreement between the members of the Committee on the following points:

1. The German members are convinced that the measures taken by the French government were "less justifiable" than those taken by the Prussian government because, they affirm, the policy of Bismarck aimed only at the realization of national unity, which was an end entirely legitimate per se.

2. The German delegation makes, in addition, the reservation that in the period from 1863 to 1870, which should be considered as a whole, Bismarck was so much hampered in his striving for German unity by the endeavors of Napoleon III to set up a "Third Germany" in the South under French influence and to create a system of alliances against Prussia (*Prusse; Deutschland*) that he [Bismarck] was bound (*a dû; musste*) to feel himself on the defensive.

The French members, on the contrary, are of the opinion that

1. Prussian policy was a threat to France because, from 1868, the German claim to Alsace was clearly formulated.

2. Napoleon III was not aiming to place South Germany under French influence but to create a Third Germany which would necessarily rely on Austria.

3. The French policy of seeking alliances was as legitimate as the policy pursued by Prussia looking towards an agreement with Russia.

IX

On the subject of Franco-German relations during the period from 1871 to 1890, the members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that

1. During this period the aim of Bismarck was to maintain the position acquired by the German Empire and that he did not seek to provoke a new conflict; no proof exists that in 1875 or 1887 Bismarck intended (*ait voulu; gewollt hätte*) war, despite the uneasiness aroused in France by certain campaigns in the German press.

2. During the same period the statesmen responsible for the conduct of French foreign policy steadfastly (*constamment; dauernd*) acted with a view to the maintenance of peace. The Boulangist agitation, which was likely to arouse uneasiness in Germany, carried with it only a section of French public opinion, and the attitude of General Boulanger, even when he was a member of the government, was disavowed by the minister of foreign affairs and the president of the Republic. Moreover, the events of 1887-89 showed clearly the complete failure of the Boulangist movement.

Consequently, the members of the Committee express the wish that

1. Statements to the effect that the German Empire wished to "impose its domination on the whole of Europe" or dreamed of "dominating the world" should disappear from certain French textbooks.

2. German textbooks should mention the opposition which the Boulangist movement encountered in France itself as well as the complete failure of this movement.

3. The textbooks of the two countries should cease to speak of threats of war since on both sides it was much more a question of fear of war.

X

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that

1. French textbooks often exaggerate the importance of the Pan-German

movement; like all active minorities, the Pan-German group was able, at various moments, to influence public opinion, but it did not influence the policy of statesmen in any permanent manner (*d'une façon permanente; stets*).

2. German textbooks exaggerate the importance of the "idea of revenge" in France; this idea of revenge prevailed in a section of public opinion during the years following the war of 1870, but it steadily lost ground (*a constamment décliné; hat . . . immer mehr an Bedeutung verloren*) after 1890 and thereafter no longer played an appreciable role.

XI

In respect of the Franco-Russian alliance, the members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that this alliance, like the Austro-German alliance, had a strictly defensive character, but that the extent of the engagements on both sides was changed in the following manner:

1. The texts signed in 1891 and 1892[10] make no reference, even indirectly, on the one hand to the question of Alsace-Lorraine, on the other hand to the question of the Straits; furthermore, the working of the alliance from 1894 to 1898 shows that no connection was in fact established between these two questions.

2. The letters exchanged between Delcassé and Muravyev [11] in August, 1899, extended the previous engagement by defining the object of the alliance as the "maintenance of the [European] equilibrium"; this new formula, not by its letter but by its spirit, might (*pouvait; konnte*) lead the French government to support Russian interests in Balkan questions and the Russian government to take account of the question of Alsace-Lorraine.

XII

The members of the Committee express the wish that French and German schoolbooks, instead of confining themselves to emphasizing the occasions when Franco-German antagonism was manifesting itself, should call attention to (*signalent; betonen*) the periods when the relations between the two countries were good, particularly from 1878 to 1884 and again from 1894 to 1898, and should refer to the tendency (*tendances; damaligen Bestrebungen*) to collaborate with regard to extra-European questions.

XIII

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that

1. The Anglo-French agreement of 1904 was in no sense (*n'était aucunement; keineswegs . . . war*) an alliance.

2. This agreement was likely to injure German economic interests in Morocco.

3. The resignation of Delcassé, which on the one hand was desired by Rouvier, president of the [French] council [of ministers], was on the other hand demanded (*demandée; gefordert*) by the German government, which made a diplomatic *démarche* on the matter.[12]

4. German policy in the Moroccan question resorted to ill-considered

[10] The diplomatic understanding and the military convention respectively.

[11] French and Russian foreign ministers of the moment. The texts of the several statements here referred to may be read in A. F. Pribram, *The Secret Treaties of Austria-Hungary, 1879-1914*, English edition by A. C. Coolidge (Cambridge, 1920-21), II, 218-21.

[12] See E. N. Anderson, *The First Moroccan Crisis* (Chicago, 1930), pp. 223-24.

methods, which were bound (*devaient; mussten*) to arouse uneasiness in France.

The German members add that Germany did not make war in 1905, when circumstances arising out of the Russo-Japanese war were favorable to her; this attitude of the German government is, in their opinion, an indication of a great desire for peace on the part of the German government; it is even looked upon by more than one German writer as one of the most serious mistakes committed by the German government.

The French members observe that the Moroccan question could and should have been settled without involving the risk of war at any moment.

XIV

The members of the Committee are in agreement, on the subject of the Moroccan crisis of 1911, in stating that

1. The occupation of Fez by French troops constituted a new fact in the Moroccan question which might (*pouvait; konnte*) give rise to a German protest.

2. The German counterstroke (*réaction; Gegenzug*), the dispatch of the *Panther* to Agadir, at the moment when diplomatic negotiations had just begun, assumed a form which French opinion might regard as threatening, although it was only, according to the phrase of Zimmermann, the undersecretary of state [in the German foreign office], the seizure of a pledge (*prise de gages; Faustpfand*) with a view to obtaining a more substantial compensation.

XV

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that

1. The Moroccan policy of France did not have as its purpose the recruiting of native troops.

2. This Moroccan policy did, however, result in the recruitment of native troops.

Reservations:

The French members request that statements should be suppressed in German textbooks to the effect that colonial policy led to a "mixing of races" (*mélange de races; Rassenmischung*) which, in their opinion, does not exist.

The German members desire to reserve this question for further examination.

XVI

The members of the Committee are in agreement, on the subject of the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907, in stating that

1. This agreement did not carry with it any general undertaking (*engagement; Verpflichtung*) for political co-operation or, in particular, make any promise to Russia in respect of the question of the Straits; on the other hand (*d'ailleurs; im übrigen*), as a result of the settlement of Asiatic questions, it left to Russia a greater freedom of action in the Balkans.

2. The Anglo-Russian rapprochement was looked upon in Germany as proof of a policy of encirclement directed against the German Empire.

XVII

In the matter of the Balkan crises of 1908-9 and 1912-13 and the versions offered by certain textbooks, the members of the Committee are in agreement in making the following statements and recommendations:

1. During the crisis of 1908-9, it is necessary to point out, on the one hand, the influence which the French government exerted on Russia with a view to the maintenance of peace, and, on the other hand, the *démarche* made by the German government at St. Petersburg on March 22, 1909, in order to secure the adhesion of Russia to the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina.[13]

2. During the crisis of 1912-13, it is necessary to point out that

(a) The German government did not attempt to reopen the Balkan question in the spring of 1912, and during the first and second Balkan wars it exerted an influence on Austria-Hungary which, on the whole, was favorable to the maintenance of peace; it was only in October, 1913, and apropos of the Serbo-Albanian dispute that the German government encouraged Austria-Hungary to action.

(b) The French government had no part in the creation of the Balkan alliance, which was negotiated under the auspices of Russia, and it did not push Russia towards war in the autumn of 1912; it only declared, apropos of Balkan complications, that it would recognize the *casus foederis* as binding (*exécuterait le casus foederis; den Bündnisfall als zur Tat verpflichtend anerkenne*), without making the reservations which it had formulated in a similar situation in 1909.[14]

XVIIa

The members of the Committee state that as a result of the periods of diplomatic tension between 1906 and 1913 the peoples of the great European states came to have (*éprouvaient; empfanden*) feelings of mistrust and mutual fear, and that the conviction that war was inevitable was tending to spread in leading circles (*milieux dirigeants; leitenden Kreisen*); these feelings and these convictions increased the chances of conflict.

But:

The German members attribute this situation in large part to the policy pursued from 1912 on by the French and Russian governments.

The French members, on the contrary, regard it as the consequence of the methods used by the German government in the preceding crises.

XVIII

The members of the Committee are in agreement in pointing out that the French military law of 1913, the law of three years' service, was drawn up only in reply to the German military bill (*projet . . . de loi militaire; Militärgesetzentwurf*) which had been announced by the German press in January, 1913. The debates on the [French] bill in the French parliament took place at the same time as those on the German bill in the Reichstag, and the German government took the French bill into account in order to hasten the vote on its own.

It is necessary that the textbooks take account of these acknowledged facts (*constations de fait; Tatsachen*).

XIX

On the subject of the military arrangements concluded by general staffs before 1914, the members of the Committee are in agreement in making the following statement:

[13] On these points, see two recent works: M. Nintchitch, *La crise bosniaque et les puissances européennes* (Paris, 1937), and B. E. Schmitt, *The Annexation of Bosnia, 1908-1909* (Cambridge, 1937).

[14] There is no adequate account, in any language, of the crisis of 1912-13.

1. The Anglo-French military and naval arrangements (*arrangements militaires et navals; militärischen und Flottenabmachungen*) which were drawn up by the general staffs from 1906 on never constituted either an alliance or an engagement binding the governments; this reservation was always expressly formulated in the documents of the time. The technical provisions (*prévisions; Massnahmen*) thus arrived at (*établies; vorgesehenen*) had only the purpose of bringing about (*permettre; erlauben*) a rapid and effective collaboration of the armed forces of the two countries in case the governments should decide to act together (*en commun; gemeinsam*). But the existence of these arrangements naturally involved (*était de nature à constituer; an sich musste . . . festsetzen*) a moral engagement for the signatories—which public opinion and the British parliament remained nonetheless free to disavow.

The French and Russian general staffs, on the other hand, had frequent exchanges of views, which led to the signature of protocols in which the length of time necessary for the concentration of military forces was stated precisely.

Finally, an Anglo-Russian naval convention was in course of negotiation in June (*juin; Juli [sic]*), 1914, but there is no document which indicates that the negotiations were continued in July, 1914.

2. The arrangements between the German and Italian general staffs led, in 1887 and in 1913, to the signature of military conventions and in 1913 to the signature of a naval convention. Between Austria-Hungary and Germany a naval convention was signed in 1913; military operations were the subject of mutual understandings (*ont fait l'objet de prévisions communes; bestanden gemeinsame Voraussetzungen*) which did not take the form of a convention.[15]

XX

The Committee is in agreement in stating that

1. The documents do not warrant the view that a deliberate desire for war (*une volonté préméditée de guerre; einen vorbedacht-planvollen Willen zu einem Krieg*)—a European war[16]—can be attributed to any government or people in 1914.

2. Bellicose currents of opinion existed in the several states.

In books used for teaching it would be wise to be content with noting that mistrust had reached a very high point, that in leading circles the idea of an inevitable war was widespread, that each [side] was attributing plans of aggression to the other, that each accepted the risk of war.

RESERVATIONS:

1. The French members make a point of recalling also, relying on German and Austrian documents, that in Germany and Austria-Hungary it was believed that time was working against the Central Powers, that, con-

[15] Reference to the controversy, precipitated by the late Heinrich Kanner, as to whether an exchange of letters in 1909 between the chief of the German general staff, Moltke, and the chief of the Austro-Hungarian general staff, Conrad von Hötzendorf, constituted a military convention. The statements concerning the naval conventions seem misleading: actually, there was a single naval convention signed in 1913 by Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Italy, the text of which is given in Pribram, I, 282-305.

[16] Evidently a distinction is made between a European war and a Balkan war.

sequently, the chances of success were greater in 1914 than they would be in the following years.

They think also that bellicose sentiments were stronger in Germany than in France and that the elections of 1914 showed the pacific intentions of the French people, as was, moreover, recognized (*constatée; festgestellt*) by the German ambassador.[17]

2. The German delegation is of the opinion that the active policy of Poincaré and Izvolsky created a situation in Europe which contained in itself a danger of war and naturally precipitated apprehensive considerations and utterances on the part of Germany (*les sérieuses préoccupations, les délibérations et les manifestations du gouvernement allemand en ont été la conséquence naturelle; in sorgenvollen Erwägungen und Äusserungen auf Deutschlands Seite seinen selbstverständlichen Niederschlag fand*); in addition, from the winter of 1913-14, Russia had decided to fulfill her historic mission in the Near East, even at the risk of unleashing (*déclencher; entfesseln*) a European war.

3. The Committee desires that the writers of textbooks should treat this question with all necessary restraint (*sang-froid; Zurückhaltung*), without stirring up passions through polemical formulas, and that they should avoid hurling serious (*massives; schwere*) accusations against governments and peoples.

XXI

The Committee is in agreement on the following statement:

The conflict of 1914 between Austria and Serbia was the culmination (*aboutissement; Ergebnis*) of a long antagonism, which had been apparent ever since the Serbian revolution of 1903 had installed the Karageorgevich dynasty in Belgrade; Austria saw in this an obstacle to her penetration of the Balkans and on the other hand could fear the danger to her unity resulting from the Serbian national movement (*pouvait, d'autre part, redouter par suite du mouvement national serbe une action dissolvante dangereuse pour son unité; konnte andererseits infolge der serbischen Nationalbewegung eine auflösende, seine staatliche Einheit gefährdende Aktion befürchten*); Austria could believe in 1913 that the expansion of Serbia in the Balkans upset the balance at her expense, as well as at Italy's; the successive measures of mobilization by which Austria supported her policy nevertheless spread uneasiness as to the maintenance of peace and could create in Serbia the impression that she was being threatened.

XXII

The Committee is of the opinion that it would be proper for French and German historical manuals to make a distinction between what was known in 1914 about the plot at Sarajevo and what is known today.

The Committee states that there is a tendency in German manuals to exaggerate the responsibility of the government in Belgrade; in French manuals, to minimize Serbian complicity.

The Committee therefore expresses the wish that

1. German manuals should not state (*présentent; hinstellen*), as certain, facts which have not been proved.

2. French manuals should not represent (*présentent; darstellen*) the

[17] A reference, perhaps, to the dispatch of Baron von Schoen of February 5, 1914. *Die grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914*, XXXIX, 250-51.

Austro-Serbian conflict as resulting solely from the actions of Austria-Hungary.

XXIII

The Committee is agreed in stating that a crown council where a general war was decided upon was not held at Potsdam on July 5, 1914—this legend has found no place in scientific French works for a long time[18]—but that there were secret conversations between Germans and Austrians at Potsdam and Berlin on July 5 and 6 and that a council of ministers took place at Vienna on July 7.

From documents concerning those discussions (*délibérations; Erwägungen*) it appears that the Austro-Hungarian government proposed, and the German government agreed, to solve the Serbian question, if need be, by arms; it appears also that William II and the German chancellor were ready to take the risk of a general war, but that at that time they believed in the possibility of localizing the conflict because they were of the opinion that Russia was not in a position to go to war.

XXIV

The Committee is in agreement in stating that, in the documents now known, there is no official French document giving an account of the conversations in St. Petersburg from July 21 to July 23, 1914.[19]

The Committee is in agreement in stating that the president of the French Republic, Poincaré, at St. Petersburg promised the Russian government that the French government would act in conformity with (*appliquerait; nachkommen werde*) the treaty of alliance, which, in the situation of that moment, implied that France was ready (*acceptait; darein willigte*) to take part in a war if Germany intervened by arms in a possible (*éventuel; vielleicht kommenden*) Austro-Russian conflict.

The German members of the Committee add that, according to their view, subsequent events warrant the belief that the assurances given by Poincaré at St. Petersburg were the equivalent of a blank check for Russia.

XXV

The Committee is in agreement in stating that

1. Germany, who was informed in time of the general tenor (*sens; Sinn*) of the ultimatum to Serbia, did not seek to exercise any moderating influence on Austria.

2. It seems likely (*dans l'ordre vraisemblable des choses; selbstverständlich*) that Russia exercised some influence on the wording of the Serbian reply, but that the exact form of this influence has not yet been made clear.[20]

[18] *E.g.*, P. Renouvin, *Les origines immédiates de la guerre* (Paris, 1925), and J. Isaac, *Un débat historique: Les origines de la guerre* (Paris, 1934)—to mention only books by French members of the Committee.

[19] See *Documents diplomatiques français, 1871-1914*, ser. 3, vol. X (*15 mars-23 juillet 1914*), p. vi.

[20] The Russian documents for July, 1914, published by the Soviet government, are silent on the matter; whether advice was given to the Serbian minister in St. Petersburg is not known, for the complete correspondence of the Serbian government for July, 1914, has not been published. A. von Wegerer, *Der entscheidende Schritt in den Weltkrieg* (Berlin, 1931), using chiefly newspaper and circumstantial evidence, argues that the Serbian government was planning to accept the Austrian demands up to noon of July 25, but on receipt of telegrams from St. Petersburg which promised Russian assistance in the event of war, changed its policy and prepared an evasive reply which Austria-Hungary would probably reject.

3. The Serbian reply to the ultimatum, even if it be admitted that it was modified as a result of Russian suggestions, remained sufficiently conciliatory, according to the opinion of even William II,[21] to permit a diplomatic solution.

XXVI

The Committee is in agreement in stating that

1. The declaration of war by Austria-Hungary against Serbia was an "error" (*"faute"; "Fehler"*), the import of which was large because it made people think that Austria-Hungary was going to undertake military operations immediately[22] and because it was certain to make (*était de nature à rendre; machte*) diplomatic negotiations more difficult.

2. Germany, although warned of this on the day before, did nothing to prevent the declaration of war, and Austria was able to believe, because of the previous declarations of the directors of German policy, that she had their full approval.

RESERVATIONS:

The German members are convinced that the German government, in giving its support to the declaration of war by Austria-Hungary, believed that the war could be localized.

The French members are of the opinion that it was hardly possible at that moment to believe in a localization of the conflict.

XXVII

On the question of the attitude of the French government and the German government from July 24 to July 30, 1914, the members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that

1. The German government declined (*a écarté; abgelehnt hat*) the British proposal of July 26 for a conference, but from July 28 to July 30 it advised Austria-Hungary, with an increasing insistence, to accept a compromise.

2. The French government did not intervene with the Russian government to advise against the partial Russian mobilization against Austria-Hungary. It advised [the Russian government] on July 30 to take no step which might give occasion for a German countermove, but the manner in which these instructions were interpreted by the French ambassador in St. Petersburg is a question still open to discussion (*qui prête encore à controverse; kann verschieden gedeutet werden*).

RESERVATIONS:

1. The German members take the view that if Germany did not play an active part in the attempts at mediation from July 24 to July 26, this does not impugn her earnest desire to keep the peace but signifies only that she resorted to other means which, in the end, received the approval of England. If it is established that Germany did not influence Austria by giving her serious warnings before July 27, this statement applies even more strongly to the attitude of France and England towards Russia; in particular, they regard it as established that the attitude of M. Paléologue[23] strongly encouraged Russia to make the conflict more acute.

[21] William II to Jagow, secretary of state, July 28, 1914, *Die deutschen Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch*, vol. II, no. 293.

[22] Actually, the Austrian general staff planned to wait until the completion of mobilization, *i.e.*, August 12, before beginning operations.

[23] French ambassador in St. Petersburg.

2. The French members have to observe that on the French side the situation was abnormal, since the head of the state and the president of the council [of ministers] were at sea from July 23 to 29.[24] They state furthermore (*d'autre part; andererseits*) that the German government confined itself to transmitting the British and Russian suggestions of July 27 to Vienna, without supporting them, and finally that it was only (*seulement; erst*) after the declaration of war against Serbia that it advised Austria-Hungary to accept a compromise.

XXVIII

The Committee is in agreement in stating that

1. The Russian general mobilization, decided on on July 30, created a new situation (*un état de fait nouveau; einen neuen Tatsachenstand*), which was bound (*devait; musste*) to entail a German decision for mobilization.

2. On July 31, when the Russian decision became known, the Austro-Hungarian government had abandoned none of its intransigency.

Reservations:

1. The German delegation is of the opinion that if the Russian general mobilization had not taken place, the German government would have been able, in the course of two or three days, to secure a modification of the Austrian point of view; it takes the position that it was only the Russian general mobilization which made war inevitable.

2. The French delegation, on the contrary, is of the opinion that even according to the Austrian documents there is nothing to show that Austria-Hungary was in the least disposed to accept a diplomatic solution and that the pressure exerted by General Moltke, on the evening of July 30,[25] was likely to strengthen the Austro-Hungarian intransigency.

It believes that this intransigency would probably have had the same effect as the Russian general mobilization, that is to say [it would have led to] *Kriegsgefahrzustand* (state of danger of war), general mobilization, and war. It believes also that in order to evaluate (*apprécier; richtig zu beurteilen*) the Russian decision correctly, the *démarche* of the German ambassador Pourtalès on July 29 must be taken into account.[26]

XXIX

The members of the Committee are in agreement in stating that at the moment in August, 1914, when the German armies violated the neutrality of Belgian territory, the German government did not allege that the Belgian government had failed to observe its duties as a neutral (***n'a invoqué aucun manquement du gauvernement belge à ses devoirs de neutralité; sich auf keine Verletzung der Neutralitätsverpflichtungen auf Seiten Belgiens berufen hat***). It is therefore inaccurate to speak of an "alleged" (***prétendue; angeblichen***) Belgian neutrality as justification of the decision to invade Belgium in August, 1914.

[24] Poincaré and Viviani were returning from their visit to Russia.

[25] Reference, presumably, to the telegram from Moltke to Conrad von Hötzendorf urging Austria-Hungary to reject the British proposal for a compromise.

[26] Between 6 and 7 p.m. on July 29 Pourtalès, acting under instructions, informed Sazonov, the Russian foreign minister, that continuation of Russian measures of mobilization would force Germany to mobilize and that a European war could then scarcely be prevented (*Die deutschen Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch*, vol. II, nos. 342, 378).

GERMAN RESERVATIONS:

1. The German delegation is nevertheless of opinion that, as was later proved by documentary investigation, Belgium had failed in fact to live up to her obligations as a neutral (*a manqué effectivement à ses obligations de neutralité; in der Tat seinen Neutralitätsverpflichtungen nicht nachgekommen ist*), in the sense that since 1913 she had made new military agreements with England, in which France probably finally participated, with a view to "concerted and joint action".

2. In addition the German invasion of Belgium had nothing to do with the general causes of the war (*n'a rien à voir avec l'ensemble des causes de la guerre; hat . . . nichts mit der Gesamtheit der Kriegsursachen zu tun*) but was a preliminary military operation imposed on Germany by *force majeure* (*Notstand*). The variant of French military Plan XVII, which provided for the entry of the 5th French army into Belgium and which was put into effect before the delivery of the German ultimatum (*la rémise de la sommation allemande; vor der deutschen Aufforderung*) in Brussels, was (*représente; stellt . . . dar*) a quite analogous military measure. From a political point of view, the violation of Belgian neutrality by Germany corresponds exactly to the violation of Greek neutrality by the Entente Powers.

3. The violation of Belgian neutrality by Germany was not a determining factor in the decision of the British government to enter the World War; in the last analysis (*en définitive; schliesslich*) it constituted only the justificative document (*pièce à conviction; Beweisstück*) desired for winning over public opinion and parliament to a war policy (*solution belliqueuse; kriegerische Lösung*). The testimony of English statesmen proves that, in the event of a violation of Belgian neutrality by France, the British government would have contented itself with a mere (*simple; einfachen*) protest.[27]

FRENCH RESERVATIONS:

The French members of the Committee have to insist on the following

[27] Reference, presumably, to discussions within the British foreign office. In 1908 Sir Edward Grey, the secretary of state for foreign affairs, put this question to the permanent officials of his office: "How far would England's liability under the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium be affected, if (1) Belgium acquiesced in a violation of her neutrality; (2) if the other guaranteeing Powers or some of them acquiesced?" Mr. (later Sir) Eyre Crowe, then a senior clerk, replied with the opinion that "Great Britain is liable for the maintenance of Belgian neutrality whenever either Belgium or any of the guaranteeing Powers are in need of, or demand, assistance in opposing its violation". On this "proposition" Sir Charles Hardinge, the permanent undersecretary, "minuted": "The liability undoubtedly exists as stated above, but whether we should be called upon to carry out our obligation and to vindicate the neutrality of Belgium must necessarily depend upon our policy at the time and the circumstances of the moment. Supposing that France violated the neutrality of Belgium in a war against Germany, it is, under present circumstances, doubtful whether England or Russia would move a finger to maintain Belgian neutrality, which [*sic*] if the neutrality of Belgium were violated by Germany it is probable that the converse would be the case". Grey added: "I am much obliged for this useful minute; I think it sums up the situation very well, though Sir C. Hardinge's reflection is also to the point" (*British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914*, vol. VIII, no. 311).

points concerning the attitude of the Belgian government, so far as it is known today: [28]

1. The documents leave no doubt about the nature of the Anglo-Belgian military conversations before August, 1914: the co-operation (*coöpération; das gemeinschaftliche Vorgehen*) which they envisaged could be realized only in the event that England decided to intervene by arms, after the violation of Belgian neutrality by a third power.

2. Not only is it impossible to find any trace of Franco-Belgian conversations or agreements prior to the declaration of war, but the correspondence of the representatives of France in Belgium with their government reveals their complete ignorance of such conversations or such agreements, the nonexistence of which is fully proved by the conduct of operations in August, 1914.

3. It is impossible to consider the variant of Plan XVII as a military measure analogous to the entry of the German armies into Belgium; it called for a disposition of troops on French territory in anticipation of a German attack through Belgium.[29]

4. The French members can accept the argument (*cas; Eintritt*) of "military necessity" only as the explanation but not as the justification of the breaking of an international engagement and of the violence done to a neutral state. It seems to them incontestable that the entry of the German army into Belgium was not the pretext which enabled the government in London to reconcile public opinion to war (*faire accepter la guerre par l'opinion publique; den Krieg der öffentlichen Meinung annehmbar zu machen*), but that it was the event which carried along parliament, as well as the government, including important statesmen who had hitherto been partisans of a policy of waiting, in an irresistible manner.

5. There is no real analogy (*analogie réelle; tatsächliche Parallele*) between the violation of Belgian neutrality, which was guaranteed by a treaty of which Prussia was a signatory, and the occupation of Salonika in 1915 by the Allies, for Venizelos, then president of the council [of Greek ministers], had authorized that occupation, though warning the Allied governments that he would protest as a matter of form.

XXX

The members of the Committee are in agreement in recognizing that

1. By reason of the Russian general mobilization the German people believed themselves challenged (*provoqué; herausgefordert*).

2. By reason of the declaration of war by Germany, which was based on information that was false,[30] the French people considered themselves unjustly attacked.

3. After the declaration of war by Germany against Russia (August 1), a Franco-German war was inevitable and was so regarded by both governments.

[28] The Belgian government has not, since the war, supplemented the *Livres gris* of 1914 by publishing its diplomatic papers of the prewar years. Knowledge, then, of Belgian policy has to be derived from the documents of other governments, which, it may be assumed, do not tell the whole story.

[29] *Cf. Les armées françaises dans la grande guerre*, I, annexes, I, 30.

[30] The declaration charged that French military aviators had thrown bombs on German territory at various places (*Die deutschen Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch*, vol. IV, no. 734b).

4. Consequently, the violations of frontier [31] did not play a decisive role and cannot be considered as causes of war or even of the declaration of war.

XXXI

The Committee, not being able for lack of time to discuss questions relating to the war itself:

1. Desires that the authors of French and German textbooks should pay the closest attention to the observations offered in the reports of the French members or in the book of Dr. Hain.[32]

2. Urges them to remove from their books anything reminiscent of wartime propaganda, to refrain from all expressions abusive of their adversaries, to recognize in equal fashion the courage and patriotic devotion of which the combatants on both sides gave proof.

3. Is of the opinion that the statements on both sides concerning atrocities of which the civilian populations were the victims should be made objectively, as far as possible, or at least that assertions should not be made without regard to evidence or to facts which contradict them.

For example, German textbooks ought not to speak of the war of *francs-tireurs* in Belgium and France in 1914 without mentioning the evidence which contradicts their assertions (*affirmation; Behauptung*).

Similarly (*réciproquement; ebenso*), French textbooks should not speak of "atrocities" committed by German troops without adding that the Germans were convinced of the existence of the bands of *francs-tireurs* and asserted that they were acting by way of reprisal.[33]

XXXII

The Committee is in agreement in stating that the events of the postwar period cannot, up to the present, have been the object of historical research based on adequate documentation, and that consequently the possibility (*part; möglichkeit*) of subjective interpretation is much greater for this period than for the preceding periods; it is therefore difficult at the moment to attempt even to formulate jointly a statement of facts which will be acceptable to both sides.

XXXIII

The Committee is in agreement in requesting that textbooks should take account of the following statements:

1. At the end of the war the occupied regions in France had been in large measure ravaged, in consequence of the devastation resulting from the military operations of hostile armies, the destruction ordered by the German authorities, such as that of the coal mines, and the seizures carried out by the same authorities;[34] the devastated regions were among the richest in France, especially from an industrial point of view.

2. Since the war was fought (*déroulée; abgespielt*) outside of German territory, except for the damage done in East Prussia in August, 1914, Germany's national economy (*capital national; Volksvermögen*) within the limits of the Reich was hardly impaired by destruction and loss; the losses

[31] On August 2 and 3 France and Germany each alleged numerous violations of frontier by the other.

[32] See note 1.

[33] Numerous books on both sides of this question have appeared in recent years.

[34] Reference, presumably, to the removal of machinery and other property to Germany.

of Germany resulted chiefly (*essentiellement; im wesentlichen*) from the cessions of territory provided for in the treaty of peace and from the sequestration of German property in the Allied countries.

XXXIV

The Committee is in agreement in stating that the principle of reparation for material damages, in accordance with the Fourteen Points of President Wilson, was laid down in the American note of November 5, 1918,[35] which was accepted by Germany as the basis of peace. The principle of a war indemnity was formally rejected (*écarté; abgelehnt*) by the Fourteen Points.

RESERVATIONS:

The German members declare that

1. Reparations became tribute in the eyes of (*pour; für*) the German people in the sense that the treaty of Versailles completely transformed, to the detriment of Germany, the juridical bases established as conditions of peace by the Fourteen Points of President Wilson, by the Lansing note of November 5, 1918, and by the terms of the armistice.

2. In the same sense, the cession of European territories and colonies, which had not been anticipated in the preliminary conditions,[36] were bound to appear to the German people as a resort to force contrary to all justice (*une méthode de force contraire à toute justice; eine ganz widerrechtliche Gewalthandlung*).

The French members declare that if it is possible to maintain (*s'il est possible de soutenir; wenn auch die Behauptung richtig sein mag*) that the provisions of the treaty of Versailles concerning reparations did, by the inclusion of military pensions, demand more from Germany than was in keeping with the application of the American note of November 5, 1918, it seems to them inaccurate to apply the word "tribute" to the totality of payments made by Germany, especially for the following reasons:

1. The deliveries in kind made by Germany were intended, in general, to provide direct compensation for material damages resulting from the war.

2. Since the total payments made by Germany to France on account of reparations amounted to less than one third (*reste au-dessous du tiers; sich auf weniger belaüft als ein Drittel*) of the lowest estimate of the material damages (see No. XXXVII), the word "tribute" cannot be applied to these payments.

The Committee recommends that both French and German views on this question should be given in the historical textbooks of the two countries.

XXXV

The Committee is in agreement in recognizing that according to the

[35] "Furthermore, in the conditions of peace laid down in his address to Congress on January 8, 1918 [the Fourteen Points], the President declared that invaded territories must be restored as well as evacuated and made free. The Allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and to their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air". Statement of the Allied governments, communicated to Germany by the American note of November 5, 1918, signed by Robert Lansing.

[36] That is, the terms of the armistice of November 11, 1918.

documents on the making (*travaux préparatoires; Vorarbeiten*) of Article 231 of the treaty of Versailles—these documents are still incompletely known,[37] but a *compte rendu* of a session of the Council of Four was read to the Committee[38]—this article did not express (*n'énonçait point; kein Urteil . . . aussprechen . . . sollte*) a judgment on the moral responsibility of Germany in [the question of] the origins of the war but was intended to establish (*établissait; aufstellen sollte*) her responsibility as a matter of civil law. Nevertheless, the form in which Article 231 was drafted,[39] the general statement of the responsibility of Germany formulated in the preamble of the Allied note of June 16, 1919, in reply to the protests of the German peace delegation,[40] and the acceptance of such an interpretation of Article 231 by the Allied governments could naturally have convinced the German people, as it did the public opinion of all countries, that the obligation to pay reparations was linked to the assertion of this moral responsibility.

RESERVATIONS:

1. The German members add that nevertheless (*gleichwohl;* no equivalent in the French text) it seems to them that German textbooks are justified in treating Article 231 as the pivotal (*central; zusammenfassende*) document, which carries with it a moral condemnation of Germany so long as it is not formally revoked by the victorious powers.

2. The French members make all reservations on this interpretation, which appears to them to be purely political and which, in their opinion, contradicts the statement made above with reference to the documents on the making of Article 231.

XXXVI

The Committee is in agreement in stating that [even] though the extent of the original Allied demands helped to place the question of reparations in a false light (*fausser; fälschen*) and to make their carrying out (*exécution; Ausführung*) difficult, the opinion gradually grew stronger (*s'est affirmée; sich . . . gekräftigt hat*) in France that only the actual cost of restoring the devastated regions should be asked for.

The French members observe that this limitation was officially accepted by the French government from the end of 1922; the German members declare that the occupation of the Ruhr completely upset the situation anew.

XXXVII

On the question of the value of the payments made by Germany, the Committee is of the opinion that the French and German textbooks ought

[37] P. Renouvin & C. Bloch, "L'article 231 du traité de Versailles: Sa genèse et sa signification", *Revue d'histoire de la guerre mondiale,* X (1932), 1-24, lifts the veil somewhat, but important documents, especially on the proceedings of the Council of Four, are still unpublished.

[38] M. Mantoux, one of the French members, was the interpreter of the Council of Four.

[39] "The Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies."

[40] This may be conveniently read in *International Conciliation* (New York), No. 37, November, 1919.

to make known both the official estimates of Germany (63,500,000,000 gold marks) and those of the Reparations Commission (17,700,000,000 gold marks) for the items accepted as relevant by the latter (*postes retenus par cette dernière; Summen, die die Reparationskommission . . . bekommen hat*) up to the end of the functioning of the Dawes Plan (August 31, 1929). The payments under the Young Plan in 1930-31 (2,900,000,000 gold marks) do not give rise to any controversy.

RESERVATIONS:

1. In support of their acceptance of the calculations of the Reparations Commission, if not as absolute figures, at least as a guide for a definite estimate (*comme représentant l'ordre de grandeur de l'évaluation exacte; so doch wenigstens als Richtlinien für eine genaue Schätzungshöhe*), the French members declare that the two following considerations may be of use (*on peut faire valoir; könne . . . gelten lessen*):

(a) The estimate of the Reparations Commission is the result of a balance struck (*équilibre; schwierigen Ausgleichs*) between the figures proposed by the several Allies, whose interests in this respect were contradictory; for the one who received from Germany a delivery in kind had an interest in valuing it at a low figure, whereas his allies had an interest in a high valuation; often the German delegates were heard before the definitive figure was adopted.

(b) The mines of the Saar provide a characteristic example. In 1924 the Germans valued them at 1,040,000,000 gold marks, the French at 291,000,000; the financial section of the Reparations Commission at a little more than 353,000,000. When the Saar was restored to Germany by the plebiscite of 1935, Germany succeeded in having the value fixed at only 15,000,000 gold marks.[41]

The French members add that, according to the estimates of the Reparations Commission up to 1929, and adding thereto the payments received by France under the Young Plan in 1930 and 1931, the total payments received by France for reparations (8,150,000,000 gold marks), even if no account be taken of the "actual value" of these graduated (*échelonnés; gestaffelten*) payments, is about one third as much as (*environ trois fois plus faible; etwa dreimal geringer . . . als*) the lowest estimate of the material damage suffered by France (26,400,000,000 gold marks).

2. The German members make reservations concerning all figures which they have not been actually in a position to examine.

XXXVIII

On the question of the occupation of the left bank of the Rhine and the Ruhr:

1. The French members of the Committee express the wish that in German textbooks the incidents concerning the occupation of the left bank of the Rhine should be given a less prominent place and that the facts mentioned should be rigorously verified and set forth in moderate language (*sans excès de langage; ohne Übertreibung des Ausdrucks*); likewise for the incidents of the occupation of the Ruhr, the origin of which has to be sought not only in the partial defaults [on reparations] which provided the occasion for it but [also] in the disputes over reparations which had preceded it.

[41] At which figure she was allowed to repurchase the mines, according to the treaty.

2. The German members, on their side, express the wish that the French textbooks should take account of this reality: the ocupation of the Ruhr, more than four years after the end of the war, led inevitably to a revival of German national feeling.

XXXIX

The members of the Committee are in agreement in expressing the wish that French and German textbooks which treat the history of the most recent period should explain clearly the origins and importance of the Pact of Locarno, indicating the bilateral character of the engagements and the guarantees which it provides.[42]

They regard it as equally desirable that the manuals should contain nothing which may seem to be in contradiction with the engagement taken mutually by the French and German governments at Locarno to respect the territorial *status quo.*

Final Resolutions

The French and German members of the Committee undertake:

1. To publish in full and as soon as possible the resolutions adopted, including the reservations, in such manner that they can be communicated to all authors and publishers of textbooks and brought to the knowledge of all teachers.

2. To use all their influence that the fullest account should be taken of the resolutions not only in textbooks but also in the teaching itself and in all publications relating to primary and secondary education (*l'enseignement du premier et du second degré; zum Unterricht ersten und zweiten Grades, in Volks-, Mittel- und höheren Schulen*).

3. To communicate to each other all useful information concerning the revision of textbooks and the changes which may come about in the teaching of history in their countries—changes of program, official instructions, publication of new textbooks, etc.

[42] This was, of course, drafted before the German repudiation of Locarno.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL HISTORY

Justus Möser. Von PETER KLASSEN. [Geschichte des Staats- und Nationalgedankens.] (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klostermann. 1936. Pp. 449. 8.50 M.)

THE preoccupation of German scholars in recent years with the rise of the modern historical point of view and the emergence of German nationalism in the eighteenth century has attracted attention to the significant part played by Justus Möser in their development. Attempts have been made, for example by Friedrich Meinecke in his *Die Entstehung des Historismus,* to show his indebtedness to the general intellectual milieu of the eighteenth century Enlightenment. Dr. Klassen, however, throughout his work stresses the autochthonous character of Möser's attitude of mind and his embodiment of incipient German nationalism. He was diametrically opposed to the "characteristic Western way of thinking" as manifested in rationalism and empiricism. The influence of Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Locke, and Shaftesbury upon him was at most indirect and negative in that in conflict with their generally rationalistic point of view his own original genius became articulate. The author places undue emphasis upon the unity and integrity of Möser's attitude of mind. He arrives at this point of view by ignoring or brushing aside what are indubitably rationalistic, pragmatic, and utilitarian elements in Möser's thought and by underscoring the irrational, activistic, and idealistic elements.

Yet Möser is not represented as a pioneer of romanticism. While he shared with the *Sturm und Drang* an appreciation of the protean quality of nature, an expression of an inexhaustible creative spirit, in his inner harmony and feeling for form and style he went beyond a mere individualistic irrationalism toward a classical point of view almost Platonic in character. He sought to penetrate to the inner form or "style" of a constitution or historical epoch. This conception of "inward form" proved to be very fruitful when applied by Möser to the interpretation of German history in his *Patriotische Phantasien* and *Osnabrückische Geschichte.* His interest was turned to history particularly by the conviction that it must serve as an educative force in the awakening of a new political spirit in the German nation and not as a museum of antiquities. He presented as an ideal early Germanic society, which he thought was animated by a spirit of devotion to the whole as well as a feeling of independence growing out of every citizen's having a stake in the form of property in the community.

Möser also saw in the ancient Germans a "will to form", which expressed itself in the formation of all manner of corporations, and a pagan spirit similar to that of the ancient Greeks and Romans. This conception of the ancient German state Möser employed as a norm in the interpretation of German history, much as Winckelmann employed an ideal construct of the Greek feeling for form in the interpretation of the evolution of ancient art. It is in the sharp delineation of this characteristic of Möser's point of view, that is, its fundamental similarity to the classicism of Winckelmann and Goethe, that Dr. Klassen believes that he has made a distinct contribution.

Wayne University. WILLIAM J. BOSSENBROOK.

Johann Gustav Droysen: Historik, Vorlesungen über Enzyklopädie und Methodologie der Geschichte. Herausgegeben von RUDOLPH HÜBNER. [Im Auftrage der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.] (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1937. Pp. xix, 444. 16.50 M.)

DESPITE the tribute of John W. Burgess, who declared himself indebted to Droysen for the knowledge and method which had brought him "happiness and success", the latter remained a figure little understood outside of Germany. He was generally dismissed, as by Fueter and Gooch, as the originator of the "Borussic concept of history" and head of the "Prussian School" and more recently by Harry Elmer Barnes as a mere nationalist. Yet Droysen's *Geschichte der Befreiungskriege,* emphasizing the universal character of all the revolutionary wars from 1776 to 1815, was not the work of a confined spirit; properly introduced, the methodological teachings of the founder of the first real seminary for modern history might have proved a wholesomely stimulating influence in this country.

Until now, the lectures delivered by Droysen on "historical encyclopedia and methodology" between 1857 and 1883 have been known mainly through his *Grundriss,* a condensation and crystallization, in part clear, in part opaque. The lectures themselves appear for the first time in this volume. Together with other relevant material they form what Droysen called a "scientology of history". Confirming and amplifying what recent Droysen literature has already brought out on the basis of scanty and at times ambiguous material, the *Historik* shows his central independent position in relation to the preceding idealistic philosophy and to his contemporaries. As early as 1846 he had observed the weakening of the ties between history and philosophy and perceived that a school was growing up which sought the self-effacement of the historian in "the facts", expecting the thought to follow automatically. Driven to contradict this Ranke school and simultaneously the claims of Positivism that it could raise history to the rank of a science, he was no less opposed to the pessimism of Schopenhauer, which denied history any scientific character. The *Historik*

demonstrates conclusively his superiority in point of methodology and epistemology to Ranke, although in other respects the latter's work remains higher. It further shows how well he anticipated the problems of the later German *Kulturphilosophie* and the *Geisteswissenschaften* of Rickert, Windelband, Dilthey, Simmel, and Spranger: the strict methodological separation of history and natural science, no "laws" controlling the singular and individual human-historical events. He had raised the troubling questions on the nature of historical understanding: when and how events and affairs become "history"; how far history is a reproduction, not of the past, but of elements which, however latent and hidden, lie in our present; how far sources are concepts by past ages of pasts still more remote; and what is the urge behind historiography—"Every present feels the need to reconstruct anew its past." A period, he felt, could not be understood from one aspect but only through comprehension of all the ideas working in it and a "Diakritik" of these ideas. The limitations of psychological interpretation he traced as clearly as if he were speaking against the Stracheys and Ludwigs. His supreme purpose was "forschend zu verstehen", to approach an interpretive understanding through research, explaining the purpose of actions as the nexus in the continuum of phenomena. "Not objectivity is the best renown of the historian; his justice is that he seeks to understand. . . . To be objective is to be merely thoughtless. Every expression of a fact is already a judgment passed on it."

The *Historik* completes the material, much of it published through the loving care of his grandson, Geheimrat Hübner, which is needed to define Droysen's work as part of the policy and ideology of the liberalism of his time—a liberalism of the right center in the parlance of the Frankfurt Parliament, humanitarian-Christian but with a more Promethean than Christian idea of historiography as the self-created cosmos of the historian. To him history was "one of the ways to widen, to enrich, to raise immeasurably the barren and lonely Here and Now of our ephemeral existence". So strongly convinced of the progress of his own time and self, he was the first to bring "sense" into the, up to then, repellent disorder of the post-Alexandrian or Hellenistic period. With this feeling of evolution and development, unbroken continuity, variously described as progressive, increasing, growing, deepening, fulfilling, Droysen emphasized the long *Nacheinander* of history rather than the *Nebeneinander,* as did the more skeptical Burckhardt. At times a sublime laissez faire loomed behind the view that laziness is the original sin, that "the history of labor is that of liberty and its progress", and that even the ethical communism of Robert Owen is demoralizing. Likewise he rejected economic autarchy and the conservatism of which Ranke was the noblest flower; he also opposed those who endowed nature with authority, "to whom it appears the highest perfection when human beings run as if grown naturally, who thus rank

the natural above the moral. . . . Only degeneration, the last stage of historic putrefaction, produces naturalness."

Clearly the publication of this work is far from an exhumation of an ideologue useful to the present-day regime of Germany. To those who recall that Droysen was a parson's son, the husband of a Jewish lady, and a close friend of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, it would seem rather an expression of Christian opposition to a paganism which Droysen, in his conviction that "the positive and progressive thought of humanity arose from the Hellenistic-Jewish union", would have abhorred no less than race-ideology. "It is mixtures", he said, "that enliven and fructify in history; out of them the new progressive forms develop."

Sherman, Conn. ALFRED VAGTS.

Corinth. Volume III, Part II, *The Defenses of Acrocorinth and the Lower Town.* By RHYS CARPENTER and ANTOINE BON with contributions by A. W. PARSONS. [The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1936. Pp. xvi, 315. Plates X. $5.00.)

THIS recent volume of the Corinth publications, well printed and richly illustrated, deals with one of the most impressive complexes of ancient, medieval, and modern fortifications. The archaeologist as well as the historian will welcome it as the first comprehensive study of the subject. The reviewer, in studying the remains for several days, with the book at hand, found it a very reliable guide to the immense and complicated ruins. In certain regards it contains more, in others less than its title suggests. On the one hand, there have been included many important topographical observations (*e.g.*, pp. 59-65, 256-65) and an appendix discussing a chamber tomb with a well-preserved funeral bed of the fifth century B.C. (pp. 297-301, pls. IX-X). On the other hand, the publication of the remains of the classical fortification is not at all complete. The late Roman city wall (pp. 58, 127) has been mentioned only incidentally, and the discussion of the most important archaic wall (p. 76) has been reserved for a future publication.

Professor Carpenter describes in a very lively survey the classical defenses, some of archaic date, but most of them dating from the fourth century B.C. (pp. 1-83). Mr. Parsons publishes an excellent and detailed report on his discovery and excavation of the Long Walls uniting the lower town with the Lechaion harbor in the second half of the fifth century B.C. (pp. 84-125, 282-96). This discussion is rich in results for the history of Greek fortifications in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. For the whole classical part the reader will miss a systematic survey of the earlier bibliography and especially a map—even a sketch, if better than that in *Real-Encyklopädie*, VI (1934), 190, would have been of some use—

showing the local situation and connection of the various parts discussed in the text.

The extensive study contributed by Mr. Bon of the French School in Athens (pp. 128-271) bears the modest title, "The Medieval Fortifications of Acrocorinth and its Vicinity". It deals, however, with the entire history of these fortifications from Byzantine to modern times. All the sources (literary, historical, drawings) have been used methodically for the first time in this neglected field, together with a detailed archaeological investigation. Mr. Bon establishes convincingly at least seven Byzantine and medieval phases of reconstruction and modification of the "Acropolis of Hellas". His conclusion, however, that most of the upper structure with artillery work has to be ascribed to the short years of the Venetian occupation, and that the four centuries of Turkish dominion have left hardly a trace, seems to be rather paradoxical. Future studies of other postclassic fortifications in Greece, initiated by this valuable work, are very much needed, as is the protection of all these picturesque historical remains.

New York University. KARL LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN.

The Rise of the Stewarts. By AGNES MURE MACKENZIE. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xvi, 398. $3.50.)

The Scotland of Queen Mary and the Religious Wars, 1513-1638. By AGNES MURE MACKENZIE. (*Ibid.* 1936. Pp. xvi, 405. $3.25.)

IN these two volumes Miss Mackenzie, already favorably known for her life of Robert Bruce, has traced the history of the Scottish kings from the death of Bruce to the Anglo-Scottish war of 1638. The first volume runs to the Battle of Flodden and the tragic death of James IV, the second deals for the most part with Mary Queen of Scots and her son James, the VI of Scotland, the I of England. Both volumes are addressed to the general reader, and neither of them is documented; though the bibliographical notes at the end of each show a familiarity with the sources of information, they are casually thrown together and quite unscientific in form. Nevertheless, there is plenty of evidence of wide knowledge of the subject and on the whole of an objective and dispassionate handling of it, though the Stewarts get rather more than their just dues, and England is a little too obviously the *bête noire*. The style is good, at times brilliant. Miss Mackenzie gives us, perhaps, the most satisfactory picture we now have of James IV, unless it be Holbein's famous portrait, which forms the frontispiece of the first of these volumes. Her cocksure attitude towards the perplexing problems connected with Mary Queen of Scots is not good history, though it may be good Scottish pride. She thinks the Casket Letters were genuine but that Mary did not write them; she is quite sure that the Babington Plot was originated by Elizabeth's servants. But she disdains

to argue about these matters. Throughout she is rather impatient of riddles, and where she cannot see clearly she prefers not to look. So the famous Gowrie Mystery is dismissed as irrelevant. She seems much less at home in dealing with the tangled intrigues of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries than in the more romantic period that preceded them, though her portraits of both James VI and of his son Charles are masterly. She is plainly not interested in matters ecclesiastical, and since these command the center of the Scottish stage during the last fifty years of which she writes, her story at the end is both dull and obscure. One would do better to read John Knox or even old Calderwood. It is not easy nowadays to catch fire at these old theological disputes, but it must be done if the reality and the significance of the issue is to be seized and portrayed. Clearly Miss Mackenzie's interests are rather with those of the sword than with those of the long robe, and rather with the fortunes of men and women than with the slow and painful evolution of institutions and ideas. We commend her for the one, we must look elsewhere for an adequate account of the other.

University of Pennsylvania. CONYERS READ.

ANCIENT HISTORY

The University of Michigan Collection: Miscellaneous Papyri. Edited by JOHN GARRETT WINTER. [Michigan Papyri, III.] (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1936. Pp. xviii, 390. $5.00.)

THIS volume represents the collective enterprise of eight scholars connected with the University of Michigan. Of the ninety-one papyri which comprise its contents (numbered 131-221 in the Michigan series), thirty-two had previously appeared in various periodicals, their republication being considered desirable as a means of promoting facility of reference and citation and as affording an opportunity to record important revisions. Each contributor has assumed complete responsibility for the material published over his own initials. Professor J. G. Winter, in addition to editing many of the individual texts, exercised an oversight in the preparation of the volume as a whole.

The papyri, all but a few of which are from the Roman period, are arranged according to subject under the following headings: Biblical Fragments, Classical Fragments, Mathematical Fragments, Astrological Fragments, Horoscopes, Magic, Libelli of the Decian Persecution, Official Documents, Petitions, Taxation, Contracts (Leases, Declarations of Property, Loans, Receipts), Agricultural Account, and Private Correspondence. The bare enumeration of these groups is sufficient to indicate the wide range of

material presented in this volume. The historian, the classical philologist, the theologian, the sociologist, and the student of comparative jurisprudence will all find much of interest and permanent value in this collection.

The work of transcribing the original documents and elucidating their contents has been performed by the several editors in exemplary fashion. By means of descriptive introductions, translations, and numerous notes on individual readings of unusual interest or difficulty they have supplied the reader with valuable aids to the use and understanding of the various texts. Classified indexes and seven collotype facsimiles further enhance the utility of the volume.

One reading calls for special comment. When Professor Sanders, in discussing (p. 18) the text of Acts xix. 14, speaks of the text as restored by him in the Michigan papyrus (No. 138) as "the original text except for the spelling σκευϊου", one feels strongly inclined to dissent. The restorations, it is true, are satisfactory in every respect and can be readily accepted. But it is one thing to say that the Michigan text has been correctly restored and quite another to claim that this fragment presents the original form of the text at this point.

With respect to the omission of ἑπτά the Michigan papyrus may indeed be regarded as preserving a pure tradition. But the soundness of two of its other readings has, for sufficient reasons, been seriously questioned, S. New and A. C. Clark rejecting Ἰουδαίου as an interpolation, and the latter regarding ἀρχιερέως as a scribal error for ἱερέως.

The present writer is inclined, moreover, to doubt the originality of the name Sceva in any of its transmitted forms (σκευϊου Mich., σκευϊα A, σκευα ℵBD), regarding ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοί τινος ἱερέως as the probable primal form of the text. Dittography, occasioned by homoeoteleuton (οι . . . οι) would be sufficient to account for the origin of the name. Bearing in mind that αι and ε became phonologically indistinguishable in the κοινή, it is not difficult to understand how the name Sceva might have been unintentionally introduced into the text by a careless copyist, *viz.*, ΕΝΟΙΣΚΑΙΥΪΟΙΣΚΑΙΥΪΟΙΤΙΝΟΣΙΕΡΕΩΣ. The need of "correcting" σκευϊοι to σκευϊου would have been felt immediately; and the temptation to substitute the genitive of Σκευᾶς, a name amply attested and undoubtedly familiar to Greek ears, for the certainly uncommon and probably unique σκευιου would likewise have been difficult to resist.

The juxtaposition of οἷς καὶ υἱοί and σκευϊου might, of course, be purely accidental. Probability, however, though admittedly furnishing unstable support for any hypothesis, weighs heavily against such a coincidence.

Princeton Theological Seminary. EDMUND H. KASE, JR.

Delphes au II^e et au I^er siècle, depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine, 191-31 av. J.-C. By GEORGES DAUX, ancien membre de l'École française d'Athènes, maître de conférences à la Faculté des lettres de Dijon. [Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome.] (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1936. Pp. iii, 745. 100 fr.)

THIS book was due, perhaps overdue, and it is doubtful whether anyone but Daux could have written it. Certainly its author had to be found in the small but distinguished group of French scholars who have devoted themselves to the publication and study of the results of the excavations at Delphi. Chronologically it is the last of the three volumes covering the history of Delphi, as illuminated by inscriptions, between the time of Epaminondas and the establishment of the Roman principate, the other two being *L'administration financière du sanctuaire pythique au IV^e siècle avant J.-C.* by Émil Bourguet and *Les Aetoliens à Delphes* by Robert Flacelière. Of the three Daux had the most unpromising task, and he began it with reluctance, but once engaged he "took a liking for his subject". For the greater part of sixteen years he studied stones and the ghosts and fragments of letters, cautiously essayed restorations, confronted epigraphic and literary texts, and worked out the meanings of obscure terms, alert to explore the multitude of problems which presented themselves to his acute mind as he proceeded, constantly clearing away the debris left by his less informed and oftentimes overdogmatic predecessors. Scholars now have the Delphian contribution to the history of the second and early first centuries B.C. organized, analyzed, and tabulated in such a way that for the first time they can control it and use it.

Of the three parts into which the book is divided the central one, entitled "Delphes et l'Amphictione de 191 à 31 avant J.-C.", will interest historians most, though they may wonder, perhaps, why chapter III, "Les Plygoniens", was not relegated to the appendixes, of which there are twelve. It establishes definitely the point that Plygonion was a West Locrian, not, as hitherto believed, a Phocian village and that it was absorbed by Delphi in 190 B.C. Though Delphi was constitutionally a free city before 191, it was completely dominated by the Aetolians. The Aetolian domination was then ended, "the autonomy o. the city and the sanctuary" reaffirmed, and the Roman consul, Manius Acilius Glabrio (sustained in 188 B.C. by the senate), authorized the Delphians to dispossess many Aetolians (West Locrians and Phocians for the most part) of lands and houses situated within the frontiers then recognized as Delphian. Subsequently, in *ca.* 125 B.C., the Amphictyony set the boundary stones of Delphi on the Roman lines. The Amphictyony, which had from of old supreme authority over the shrine at Delphi, was reorganized after the Aetolian debacle. Delphi had then to fear the resumption of the Thessalian primacy in this body, which had been formally recognized as late

as 278 B.C., and in fact it seems that in 182 B.C. the Thessalians were the most influential party in the council. In 178 B.C. the scene is changed. Perseus became king of Macedon in 179 B.C., and next year, besides being personally represented by two votes in the council, he controlled four additional votes. Aetolia also had six votes, five of them exercised by noncitizens of the *ethne* to which these Amphictyonic rights belonged—an unprecedented affirmation of Aetolian solidarity. Delphi, with its traditional two votes, had the primacy. There were five seats controlled by the Thessalians. With this setup the Amphictyony had, potentially at least, a pro-Macedonian character. Moreover, "l'Amphictione exerce, sur les biens du dieu, un contrôle actif" (p. 315). We can hardly fail to see in this recasting of the council the effect of Perseus's efforts to win the favor and support of the Greeks, which entered into the diplomatic background of the Third Macedonian War.

As a consequence of Pydna "l'Amphictione échappait pour toujours aux intrigues étoliennes et macédoniennes. Son rôle désormais ne sera plus jamais politique" (pp. 328 f.). The ancient scheme of membership was re-established, and arbitration was resorted to on various occasions to determine to whom precisely votes belonged. From his discussion of one of these adjudications Daux reaches the conclusion, which will be of interest to students of early Greek history, that the Lacedaemonians never belonged to the Peloponnesian group which shared one of the Dorian votes but were grouped with the Dorians of the "metropolis", Doris, in the exercise of the other (pp. 329 ff.). Freed from the close oversight of the Amphictyonic Council, Delphi managed the sanctuary with more independence than ever before and mismanaged its finances so flagrantly that *ca.* 125 B.C. a serious scandal occurred. This was precipitated by the protests of thirteen Delphian notables who, after having been exiled by the local authorities, appealed to the Roman senate. The senate ordered the governor of Macedon to convene the Amphictyonic Council for the purpose of making a general inventory of the property of the shrine. A deficit of 53 talents 35 minae (1½ million francs) was discovered in the sacred funds, and thirteen Delphians, also notables, were required to make it good (pp. 372 ff.). Delphi made a better use of its freedom by working hand and glove with Athens, mistress of Delos and the cult of the Pythian Apollo there, in elevating the religious and cultural significance of its sanctuary. This is the epoch not only of the revival of the Pythais from Athens to Delphi, to which Daux devotes one of his best chapters (pp. 521-83), but also of the inauguration of the Pythais from Athens to Delos.

C'était donner au culte d'Apollon Pythien dans l'île une importance nouvelle; c'était dans une certaine mesure reconnaître la suprématie du sanctuaire de Delphes. Il est vain de se demander quels développements cette politique eût été susceptible de prendre; elle fut brutalement inter-

rompue par les guerres de Mithridate. Mais peut-être a-t-on le droit de dire que Delphes, vers la fin du II^e^ siècle et le début du I^er^, a porté un moment le flambeau de la religion antique. Elle est vraiment le centre de la piété grecque, le lieu de pèlerinage où les hommes de bien trouvent une consécration (p. 582).

It is impossible to note all the numerous details in which Daux augments our knowledge. It must suffice to say in conclusion that this is a book exceptionally rich in new data and new points of view. No historian interested in the late Hellenistic age can afford to ignore it.

Harvard University. W. S. Ferguson.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Cambridge Medieval History. Planned by J. B. Bury. Edited by C. W. Previté-Orton and Z. N. Brooke. Volume VIII, *The Close of the Middle Ages.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xxvi, 1079. Maps 78-86. $12.00. Eight volumes complete, $90.00.)

This is the concluding volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History,* which has been over twenty-five years in the making. Volume I appeared in 1911 and was followed by Volume II in 1913, both under the editorship of H. M. Gwatkin and H. P. Whitney. The project was then interrupted by the war, and it was not until 1922 that a somewhat attenuated Volume III reached publication. Since then the work has steadily progressed, largely through the loyal efforts of C. W. Previté-Orton and Z. N. Brooke, who have served on the editorial board for the past fifteen years. Since the death of J. R. Tanner in 1930 Previté-Orton has acted as chief editor.

Readers familiar with the seven earlier volumes of the series should know what to expect in the eighth: a majority of the chapters continuing narratives of political and ecclesiastical history, either from the volume immediately preceding or from those before it; a number of more comprehensive chapters on special topics; long bibliographical lists, usually without criticism of individual books; and a variety of serviceable, though not very beautiful, maps. Such are actually the contents of this eighth volume. G. H. Orpen, C. S. Terry, Kamil Krofta, Rafael Altamira, and A. A. Tilley give continuations of what they wrote for Volume VII on Ireland, Scotland, Bohemia, Spain, and the Italian Renaissance. In other cases the narrative is taken up by different authors. The history of the papacy and the councils is carried on by W. T. Waugh and Edward Armstrong; that of Florence by Cecilia M. Ady; that of Germany by R. G. D. Laffan; that of England by K. B. McFarlane and C. H. Williams; that of France by Joseph Calmette and Charles Petit-Dutaillis. The contributions of Henri Pirenne on the Low Countries, of Halvdan Koht on the Scandinavian king-

doms, of Alexander Bruce-Boswell on Poland, and of Balint Homan on Hungary cover the fourteenth as well as the fifteenth century. The history of the Burgundian kingdom from its origin to the French acquisition of Provence is sketched by Paul Fournier; that of Portugal throughout the Middle Ages by Edgar Prestage. Sir Charles Oman writes on "The Art of War in the Fifteenth Century" and G. R. Potter on "Education in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries"; but the other cultural studies have a broader scope: "Political Theory in the Later Middle Ages", by H. J. Laski; "Magic, Witchcraft, Astrology, and Alchemy", by Lynn Thorndike; "Painting, Sculpture, and the Arts", by W. G. Constable. Previté-Orton adds an epilogue on the significance of the period called the Close of the Middle Ages.

Volume VIII resembles its predecessors in other respects also. Too often, in the eyes of the present reviewer, the chapters are mere segments of political annals which fail, both singly and in combination, to emphasize the dominant features of the age. Ecclesiastical affairs are treated in perhaps a dozen places; yet the Church as a world institution is never seen in true perspective. Despite the many pages on the comings and goings of Lancastrians and Yorkists, we find no clear analysis of the English constitution either in 1400 or in 1485. And many another great development of the fifteenth century—being dealt with perhaps in Volume IV of the *Cambridge Medieval History* or Volume I of the *Cambridge Modern History*—is here lost to view. For instance, the present volume falls short of explaining the conflict between Christian and Moslem in the Balkans, the Slavic counter-offensive against the Germans on the Baltic, the effect of shifting trade routes upon international relations and maritime activity, the advance to fortune of the Habsburg dynasty, or even the creation of a despotic monarchy in Spain.

The volume is, however, studded with bright exceptions. Although the reigns of Charles VII and Louis XI have often been described, the reader will find much that is fresh and arresting in the admirable chapters by Calmette and Petit-Dutaillis. A sketch of the Low Countries in the later Middle Ages by Pirenne could hardly lack balance and lucidity. Fournier, in twenty-five pages, has contributed a fine account of the Burgundian kingdom. Prestage and Homan have written clear, well-rounded essays on Portugal and Hungary. Among the studies of later medieval culture, three are especially welcome. Laski's chapter on political theory is outstanding in both thought and expression. Thorndike provides what we have missed even in his own books—a simple introduction to the complexities of medieval magic and pseudo-science. And it is good to find, after long neglect in this learned series, a description of Gothic arts, however brief, by W. G. Constable.

Although the earlier volumes of the *Cambridge Medieval History* have

all been separately reviewed in this journal (XVII, 592; XIX, 588; XXVIII, 93; XXIX, 749; XXXII, 574; XXXVI, 105; XXXVIII, 535), now that the set is completed, something may be said of it as a whole. According to the general preface in the first volume, "The present work is intended . . . partly for the general reader, as a clear and, as far as possible, interesting narrative; partly for the student, as a summary of ascertained facts . . .; partly as a book of reference, containing all that can reasonably be required in a comprehensive work of general history." The extent to which the *Cambridge Medieval History* has fulfilled the hopes expressed by the editors in 1911 is scarcely a matter of doubt. Most of its 187 chapters are distinctly not what the general reader, even in academic circles, would call interesting narratives. As fireside reading one might as well choose the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.* The very real usefulness of the series must always be as a work of reference, and anyone who frequently consults it—whether or not a candidate for a degree—will *ipso facto* be a student.

As such a work of reference, the *Cambridge Medieval History,* being the only detailed and scholarly account of the Middle Ages in the English language, is invaluable and should be readily accessible in every general library. Of the years between A. D. 300 and 1500 there are very few for which, in one of the volumes, the student will not find an able summary of events by a specialist. The series is remarkable merely as a collection of writings by eminent historians. In the list of contributors stand the names of scholars not only of Great Britain and the British dominions but also (as reported in the preface to Volume VIII) of "Austria, Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, and the United States of America". And many of their chapters give information that would otherwise be unavailable to all but experts on the particular subject.

Obviously, however, these eight volumes are not so much a history as a collection of historical essays, the quality of which is very uneven. In a work written by persons of many schools and largely translated from foreign languages uniformity of style could hardly be expected. But statements of fact and opinion also vary; for the editors have tolerated a rather distressing amount of duplication and discrepancy. There are many gaps, especially in the treatment of subjects that defy classification as national history. And despite the neat titles of the volumes, the arrangement is not always chronological; the reader will often have trouble in knowing just where a particular survey may be. Thus he will find the chapter on the First Crusade in Volume V preceded by one on the Fourth Crusade in Volume IV; and for the other crusades he will have to consult at least three indexes. The communal movement is discussed in the fifth volume, the revival of trade and urban life in the sixth. Volume IV tells how the Mongols subjected Russia and how the Ottoman Turks conquered the Byzantine Empire,

while Volume VII explains the beginnings of Russia, and Volume VIII sketches the Hungarian resistance to the Turkish advance. Gothic art is introduced in the third volume and reintroduced in the sixth, but is described only in the eighth.

In using the *Cambridge Medieval History* one should therefore remember that its volumes are not well integrated units and that comparatively few topics are fully developed in the "ordered collection of monographs" projected by Acton and Bury. So far as political history is concerned, one can normally count on a reliable summary of events, with the occasional inspiration of brilliant comment or lucid analysis. France, in the opinion of the reviewer, is excellently treated throughout. The presentation of English history is generally good, especially the earlier portions. The chapters on Germany, though forming a continuous narrative, are for the greater part excessively dull. And as the result of topical subdivision there is no historical synthesis for the Holy Roman Empire at large, or even for Italy. As would be expected in a work planned by Bury, the discussion of Roman and Byzantine history is unusually thorough. The development of Islam and the Arab power is admirably described. There are some really splendid accounts of barbarian peoples and of their conquests and political institutions—notably those of the Franks under the Merovingians and Carolingians. On the minor states of eastern Europe and western Asia the chapters of the *Cambridge Medieval History* are likely to prove the most useful in English.

With respect to other fields the verdict cannot be so favorable. One may read all the sections dealing with ecclesiastical history—many of them excellent surveys by distinguished scholars—and yet gain slight understanding of what the Medieval Church was, slight appreciation of its epic rise, ascendancy, and decline. Nor can one learn, from a scattering of little chapters on cultural odds and ends, how a new European civilization came into being. Even one who merely wishes to review a single phase of human achievement is likely to be disappointed, for the treatment of education, learning, literature, and the arts is generally inadequate. Occasionally a good essay will be encountered, but all too often such matters are relegated to perfunctory appendixes.

For these shortcomings the present editors are not, of course, to be blamed. They have done their best with a plan inherited from an earlier generation—a plan first adopted for the *Cambridge Modern History* and then, by way of afterthought, applied to earlier times. The procedure was not altogether a happy one, for a design governed by the nationalistic concepts of the nineteenth century was particularly ill-suited to the medieval period. And the new series did not find a very understanding architect in Bury, who in 1913 (*History of Freedom of Thought*, p. 52) could still call the Middle Ages "a millenium in which reason was enchained, thought was enslaved, and knowledge made no progress".

As remarked by Powicke (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XLVIII, 465), Bury's scheme has come to be "increasingly out of relation to the trend of contemporary studies, which try to analyze and explain the lateral unity of history, the organic dependence upon each other of the various expressions of life and thought". In 1911 the *Cambridge Medieval History* was bravely launched "as a comprehensive account of medieval times". This it assuredly is not. However indispensable the present compilation may be, it cannot be praised as anything like a balanced picture of the Middle Ages. Such a project, should it ever be contemplated in the English-speaking world, will have to be planned anew.

Cornell University. CARL STEPHENSON.

Church & Learning in the Byzantine Empire, 867-1185. By J. M. HUSSEY, Research Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. ix, 259. $4.25.)

Miss Hussey's book covers a wide range of the history of the Byzantine Empire, even though she seeks to touch upon only one of the aspects of its culture, albeit for us moderns that which is perhaps the most significant and lasting. She starts with the development of learning and traces this through the reigns of the Macedonian dynasty, through the turgid course of the eleventh century, and to the end of the decorous neo-orthodoxy of the semi-enlightened Comneni.

After a brief historical introduction of a general nature (ch. I), the author passes to a general consideration of learning under the Macedonian dynasty (ch. II), which is rather slight and discusses the background of the eleventh century revival of learning. The tenth century is dismissed in a couple of pages (pp. 37-38), and she then passes to a consideration of affairs intellectual in the eleventh century, which forms the real kernel of her exposition. In fact, one gathers the impression that the book grew out of a study of figures like Psellus and the three Johannes, Mauropous or Euchaita (of whom she promises us a biography, p. 41, n. 1), Italus, to whom chapter V is devoted, and Xiphilinus, the later patriarch. Chapter III is devoted to the reopening of the University of Constantinople; the writer holds that there were two distinct faculties, one of law and one of philosophy. Psellus she defends (in ch. IV) against those who besmirched him, though the mud, according to Diehl, was in Psellus's own character. Miss Hussey insists on the strong Neoplatonist strain in this chameleon figure. Some space is given to the persecution of heretics under the Comneni, but little motivation is indicated. The suggestive and well-documented article of Marr on Ioann Petritsi is not cited in this connection. The reviewer inclines to the opinion that this trend reflects the distrust of the aristocratic party, which supported the Comneni, for the intellectuals and bureaucrats. These, too, were suspect to the church and accordingly incurred the odium of both camps. Chapter VI treats of the scholars of the Comnenian period,

touching especially on satires like the Timarion and the poems of Theodore Prodromus.

Chapters VII-X deal with the ecclesiastical organization, the patriarchs, and the monasteries. While a vivid picture is given of the life in the smaller monasteries near the capital, the influence and position of the greater monastic centers, such as Athos, Olympus, and Latmos, not to mention others, are not properly evaluated. They supplied in large measure the missing element of distance and (in time) tradition which had attached to the Holy Land, and few were familiar enough with them to have contempt engendered. The last chapter is a sympathetic study of that appealing mystic, Symeon the Younger. Here, too, the author promises us further light, which will be most welcome. The book is attractively written and well printed.

Quotations in the original Greek are infrequent; the rendering of that on page 86 is rather free. The Russian lemmas of Th. Uspensky's article and that of Yakovenko are somewhat carelessly rendered (pp. 246, 247).

The reviewer cannot help feeling that had the introductory chapters been omitted and the basic ones expanded, the work would have been greatly improved. The canvas is a bit large for the treatment. One should also bear in mind that the army had its say in the eleventh century and left some of it in writing—witness Kekaumenos's grim saws and anecdotes.

Harvard University. ROBERT P. BLAKE.

Serjeanty Tenure in Medieval England. By ELIZABETH GUERNSEY KIMBALL, Mount Holyoke College. [Yale Historical Publications.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1936. Pp. ix, 277. $3.00.)

MEASURED by the standard of significant substantial contribution and originality of research, this is a work of great merit. Pollock and Maitland provided merely a general introduction to serjeanty, and Round was concerned only with the serjeanties which owed service to the king, particularly at court. Miss Kimball deals with serjeanty tenure from the early half of the twelfth century through the period of change to about 1300. Serjeanty services appear earlier than tenure by serjeanty, as Domesday Book bears witness, and are not themselves evidence of tenure. Evidence concerning serjeanty tenure is none too abundant, and Miss Kimball finds it impossible to clear up various minor problems. Nonetheless, she has produced some new information regarding the chief marshal and the butler and has shown the necessity of modifying Round's view that arrentation of a serjeanty brought it to an end. What is more important, from the evidence of recorded cases, scattered through much official record, she has set forth a scheme which is practical and not, like that of the law writers, theoretical. She has treated this particular tenure as a development rather than as something static. Moreover, she has included serjeanties held of mesne lords.

Through her painstaking work she has placed students of medieval English land law and institutions under lasting obligation.

Serjeanty is seen to present many peculiar aspects. The services of some serjeanty tenants were honorable, of others, menial. Such tenants formed no specific social class. The grouping of services to fit them into a tenurial scheme, made apparently in the twelfth century, was haphazard. When several services were rendered by an individual, there is often doubt as to which are by reason of tenure. The *serviens* was sometimes the holder of an office or one who rendered military service, in neither case by virtue of landholding. Furthermore, serjeanty tenure in the thirteenth century was to some extent assimilable to knight service and to socage. The resemblance to socage was greatly increased by 1250 as lands alienated from serjeanty holdings were arrented. Serjeants never provided all the personal service of a given kind which the king required, and serjeanty afforded no large military contingent despite the rule that the service of two serjeants satisfied that of a knight.

Miss Kimball proves that grand and petty serjeanties did not exist as distinct tenures in 1300. There were large serjeanties and small serjeanties, but so diverse in character that classification went little further than placing in the former group serjeanty rendering service in the king's host. The law writers of the thirteenth century usually indicated that wardship and relief as well as homage were required from serjeanties of this type but that the smaller ones followed the usage of socage tenure. These general rules are found in practice to require qualification. Serjeanties were not legally subject to scutage. Their partition amongst co-heiresses, illegal in 1200, became accepted usage half a century later. The rule governing alienations from serjeanties underwent similar transformation, and the investigation throws welcome light on general crown policy as to alienation.

It seems almost captious to mention that the barony of Lancaster in 1199 by inadvertence once becomes the duchy and that *ut de corone* (p. 169) marks one lapse in an excellent piece of proofreading. But John, duke of Lancaster (p. 88), did not become king of England. The reviewer would not reject the views of G. H. White concerning the chamberlainship of Geoffrey de Clinton on the ground that the office pertained to the lower exchequer. Herbert the Chamberlain, as prototype of the treasurer, would seem to have been attached to the receipt before there was an exchequer and the successors of Mauduit, chamberlain of the treasury, designated for ages as acting chamberlains of the lower exchequer. Mr. R. Stewart-Brown's *Serjeants of the Peace,* which appeared while this volume was in press, provides a few additional instances of baronial serjeanties. It also suggests that some of their services were of pre-Conquest origin and thus incidentally that baronial serjeanties may not always have arisen later than crown serjeanties.

University of California. WILLIAM A. MORRIS.

Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of the Troubadors and of the Courts of Love. By MELRICH V. ROSENBERG. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1937. Pp. vii, 303. $3.50.)

MANY an intelligent person, not too well read in the field of the Middle Ages, will find in Mr. Rosenberg's book a fairly readable, though often misleading, introduction to Eleanor of Aquitaine's career and times. The author writes like an explorer entering what is, to him, an uncharted sea, making entertaining discoveries which he relates, if not in impeccable English, at least with gusto. But if one has sailed the sea before, the author's story is apt to leave him quite cold, to say the least.

Mr. Rosenberg has covered the ground and in doing so has shown industry in gathering material. In his account will be found most of the recorded facts about Eleanor, most of the traditional stories, and certainly all the scandal. In addition he has made accessible in translation the twenty-one cases of the courts of love as given by Andreas Capellanus. But while Mr. Rosenberg's enthusiasm and industry claim appreciation, his lack of any systematic training for his work has placed him from its very beginning under a severe handicap, which accounts for much that is unsatisfactory in his book. For example, he has either failed to discover, or failed to appreciate the value of, the most important work that has yet appeared on his subject, namely, Alfred Richard's *Histoire des comtes de Poitou* (2 vols., 1903). A proper use of this work would have saved Mr. Rosenberg many an error, both great and small.

Another handicap imposed on the author by his want of training is the lack of well-defined critical standards by which to assess the relative value of his materials. He has, indeed, striven valiantly to be critical, witness the notes in his bibliographical list of one hundred titles, a list notable both for its inclusions (Lavisse and Rambaud; Mills, *Chivalry,* 1826, etc.) and its omissions (Lavisse, *Histoire de France;* Gautier, etc.). His conceptions of what constitutes a "contemporary authority" are very generous. It is true that Eleanor's life was a long one (1122–*ca.* 1204) and that a monastic chronicler born in 1204 might perhaps be considered a "contemporary", but to dub William of Nangis (d. 1301 or later) a "contemporary authority" for events that occurred before 1150 (pp. 40, 112) is carrying the matter a bit too far. Guided by such critical standards, it is not surprising to find the author accepting as sober historical fact both the Amazonian legend, which rests solely on the authority of Nicetas, a Byzantine historian, writing more than half a century after the Second Crusade, and, on the authority of Dugdale (1605-86), the Rosamond myth (p. 185). Eleanor, a raging fury, tracks down the "Fair" Rosamond at the heart of a "maze" no mention of which finds its way into the written record for well on toward two hundred years after the supposed event.

But it is not so much these errors that detract from the effect of the

narrative as the author's failure really to understand and to portray sympathetically the interests, the mental equipment, and the emotions of the twelfth century humanity about which he is writing. For example, the religious thought and feeling of twelfth century people, so vitally intertwined in all their activities, is a closed book to him. He has read a great deal about the period and taken many notes, but he has never fully assimilated his material. He has not even, it appears, ever formulated in his own mind a vital conception of Eleanor's personality and character—a failure which leaves a vacuum at the very heart of the book. It would actually seem, indeed, that his main interest is rather in the troubadours and courts of love than in Eleanor herself.

Vanderbilt University. CURTIS H. WALKER.

The Royal Domain in the Bailliage of Rouen. By JOSEPH REESE STRAYER. (Princeton: University Press. 1936. Pp. 275. $3.50.)

THIS book contains the text of MS. 2665 of the municipal library of Rouen, listed in the latter's official catalogue as "Etat du domaine royal dans les vicomtés de Rouen, du Pont-Audemer, de Bernay, du pays d'Auge, et du Pont-de-l'Arche". The editor has added a thirty-page introduction, numerous notes of identification, and an extensive index of names and places.

Written probably in the years 1261-66, this document seems to have been the work of the clerk of the *bailli* of Rouen and is clearly a revised list of the royal holdings in the *bailliage,* based upon the reports of special investigators using the sworn inquest, upon exact measurements of disputed areas, and upon previous records not now extant. The purpose of the record was undoubtedly to increase the revenue collected in the district. There are very few erasures, few demonstrable errors, and a large number of blank spaces still awaiting, apparently, the more exact information which was never secured. The result is a document filled with material concerning the administrative districts of the *bailliage,* kinds and amounts of revenue, etc. Since the need was for money, not for political or military services, a large part of the royal holdings was farmed out. Professor Strayer goes into some detail in his introduction in regard to this farming of the domain, its necessity, the process of letting the farms, the determination of values, and the identity of the farmers.

The editor has done his work with care. The introduction is helpful, reflecting wide and sound learning; the index is complete for persons and places mentioned in the document. The introductory chapter, however, is far from exhaustive; the notes hardly do more than identify persons and places, leaving many legal and financial terms unexplained; the index, not covering the very considerable material contained in the editor's own introduction, is strictly limited to persons and places and thus leaves the great

wealth of the document on the institutional side unexplored and, for most students, unavailable.

Professor Strayer has given us a good edition of a document valuable for the institutional, economic, and legal history of Normandy and of France in the middle of the thirteenth century. It is to be hoped that he will develop the possibilities of this record even more fully in his subsequent publications.

Smith College. SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

Das deutsche Mittelalter. Erste Hälfte, *Das Reich* (*Hochmittelalter*). Von Dr. HEINRICH GÜNTER, Professor an der Universität München. [Geschichte der führenden Völker.] (Freiburg i.B.: Herder; St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company. 1936. Pp. vi, 376. $4.25.)

THIS volume, in a series edited by Heinrich Finke, Hermann Junker, and Gustav Schnürer, is a contribution to the ideology of the Medieval Empire, so brilliantly illuminated by Bryce's essay of 1864, whose viewpoint the author also claims for his own. Since Sybel and Ficker began the controversy eighty years ago, literature has accumulated on the question whether the German rulers spent their strength foolishly south of the Alps and left Germany to disintegration (see G. v. Below, *Die italienische Kaiserpolitik, Hist. Zeitsch.*, suppl. X, 1927, and the long bibliographical note in this book, p. 351). Below said that the only justification for them could be found in the altruistic idea of service to the Church. Years ago an academic prize essay (Tübingen, 1891) led Dr. Günter to consider the "exclusively Christian character of the *Kaisertum*", and his more recent writings have sought to trace its origin and development from that angle. He has, accordingly, discussed the attitude of the patristic writers towards the Christian Roman Empire and the relation of the papacy with Byzantium and the Frankish mayors (see his *Deutsche Kultur*, 1932, pp. 94 ff. and the Munich university address, *Das mittelalterliche Kaisertum*, 1933). The empire of Charlemagne, from which that of Otto I derived, rested on the concept of the Christian duty of the emperor as protector of the "Erlösungswerk im römischen Raum". The empire was thus a "christliches Patronat" and not a world dominion; but missionary ambition may have outstripped sound political organization. On this thesis the present volume is written, and it traces the "christliche Reichsidee" from 919 to 1250. Dr. Günter believes that this thought gives meaning and dignity to the efforts of the German rulers, though he allows that the goal was unattainable from the start and the endeavor suffered shipwreck on inner and outer particularism. Of his five chapters, the first, "Vom Stamm zum Reich", deals with Henry I and the determination of Otto I for the *renovatio imperii*. The second, "Die deutsche Führung", goes from 962 to 1056. The third, "Die Verschiebung des Schwergewichts", describes the preponderance of the reform movement

under Henry IV and ends with the irruption of particularism and the conflict of Guelf and Ghibelline in the reign of Conrad III. The fourth chapter deals with the *renovatio imperii* of Frederick Barbarossa and the debacle under his sons; the fifth and last covers the time of Frederick II, when the *reformatio imperii* labors under the burden of the Sicilian inheritance, and *imperium* yields to *territorium*.

The volume is not recommended to the casual student; it reads too much like a résumé of the *Jahrbücher* or certain chapters in the *Cambridge Medieval History*. It is neither a textbook nor an essay but an application of political and military details to the author's notion of the Christian Empire. There are several maps, plates of various emperors, and an adequate index of names and places. References and bibliographical footnotes have been collected at the end of the book.

University of California. BERNARD J. HOLM.

Der Aufstieg des Papsttum im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte, 1047-1095. Von Dr. ALEXANDER CARTELLIERI, O. Professor an der Univeristät Jena. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1936. xliii, 291. 15 M.)

THIS is the third of Professor Cartellieri's impressive volumes on the medieval world (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIII, 174; XXXVIII, 312). From the vantage of *Weltgeschichte*, meaning thereby the history of England, Continental Europe, and the Byzantine and Islamic East, he hopes to avoid what he calls "the artificial division into periods" which has hitherto obscured historical writing. Yet he chooses no less rigorously than in his previous volumes to narrate unrelieved political history. That is, of course, his privilege. It leads him to refuse to consider the body of controversial literature arising from the investiture struggle because it is impossible to be sure where, when, and from whom it arose, and who read it, and therefore it must be consigned to the realm of political theory. Countess Mathilda's personal appearance must be of interest to us because of the power she wielded over men. Therefore it is with scholarly regret than one can only say that she was a blonde, even if a reddish-blonde.

The author writes as a patriotic German devoted to "die alte Wahrheit". His political ideal is a unity based on something more than a dynasty, whose past utility he recognizes, a unity which encourages, moreover, cultural diversity. His account of the speedy decline of the empire from the great days of Henry III is therefore tinged with lament. This does not, however, express itself in criticism of Gregory VII, whom he evaluates as the greatest figure since Charles the Great, but rather in reiterated complaint of the petty selfishness of German princes which blinded them to the imperial program. It is "das ganze Elend der Kleinstaaterei" (p. 153) which spoiled everything. Canossa, accordingly, might well have been a tactical victory, but it was also a defeat, a defeat for which the princes

were primarily responsible. The author's strong feeling on this point leads him to exaggerate the significance of Rudolf's election at Forchheim and to overemphasize the unity which the German peoples had achieved in the empire. On more than one account it is a little too human to take pride in Norman accomplishments because the Normans were, after all, Germanic, and at the same time to associate these Normans with the German princes in spoiling what the Germans, united in an empire, had done.

Cartellieri's work is extremely useful as a summary of a great amount of careful reading, kept up-to-date and inclusive of whatever pertinent American work was available to him. If there is a date, the author gives the best one; if a place, he locates it; and he does not hesitate to use Baedecker to give the height of Canossa. His footnotes lead to the exact spot in the sources and recent secondary literature. His point of view sometimes makes possible insights that are ordinarily obscured. It is possible, for example, from his treatment, to get a European view of the investiture struggle and some idea of its comparative intensity. If one wants for his political outline something more than *Gebhardt* and something both less and more than the *Jahrbücher,* he will make no mistake in going to Cartellieri.

The University of Nebraska. EDGAR N. JOHNSON.

Les origines des guerres d'Italie: La France et l'Italie au temps du Grand Schisme d'occident. Par MICHEL DE BOÜARD. (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1936. Pp. 439. 40 fr.)

THE purpose of this study, as stated in the preface, is to trace "the thread that runs through" the involved relations between Italian states and French princes from the beginning of the Great Schism to the Council of Constance. If M. de Boüard does not convince us that there was any single thread running through "the ocean of political facts, military enterprises, diplomatic negotiations, and religious controversies" of that period, it is because in his fidelity to his evidence he refrains from forcing an artificial unity. His narrative shows for each move an immediate objective rather than a well thought out aim. Foreign aid was sought when needed and discarded when the need was past. There was no consistent French action in Italy precisely because the interests involved were not those of France or the French crown but the inconsistent interests of French princes, of whom now one and again another had the ear of the king.

If the last quarter of the fourteenth century was the high tide of French intervention, this was due, M. de Boüard shows, to conditions in Italy. Gian Galeazzo Visconti hoped to use Orleanist marriage alliances in support of his ambitions towards a North Italian state. The Florentine signory, in the fight against the formation of such a state and in the desire for peace

to keep business going, was conciliatory towards the French king and the French pope. Weariness of the Guelf-Ghibelline struggle and fear of the Visconti led a faction in Genoa to give over the city to the French king. The folly of the Roman pope strengthened the cause of his rival, whose treasury in turn gave support to the Angevin claims on Naples. The failure of French intervention in the early years of the fifteenth century is attributed by the writer not to one but to a variety of causes. The designs of the Visconti on Genoa and those of Florence on Pisa were incompatible with the sovereignty of the French king over those ports. Louis II of Anjou was himself incapable, and he lacked support. The insanity of Charles VI and the struggle between Armagnacs and Burgundians made Italian adventure impossible. For the schism itself, for which in the beginning he holds the French king responsible, the writer is insistent upon a fact on which most of his readers will need no argument, that partisanship was determined not by religious conviction but by shifting political expediency. Its settlement, long wished for by all, was brought about, he shows, by the reentrance upon the scene of the empire, in the person of Sigismund, to perform one of its last useful functions.

M. de Boüard sees that it is an anachronism to look for any policy of Italian unification in the territorial ambitions of the Visconti or the rivals for the Sicilian throne or the temporary leagues formed among Italian states. What resulted from the threats to communal independence and an Italian papal state and equally from "compelling economic laws" was the formation of the great states of the Renaissance. To the worldly-wise Italians, skilled in "Machiavellian finesse", France would in the fifteenth century, as she had in the fourteenth, vainly oppose her less adroit adventurers.

Although somewhat overweighted with narrative detail, the study is of real value for its faithful presentation of facts secured by skillful combing of national, papal, and local archives. It may be regrettable that more of the hitherto unpublished documents are not given among the *pièces justificatives* and that those given are not always the ones which are most important for the subject. The study is a thesis presented to the Faculty of Letters of the University of Paris.

Mount Holyoke College. J. M. Tatlock.

James I, King of Scots, 1406-1437. By E. W. M. Balfour-Melville, Mackay Lecturer in History in the University of Edinburgh. (London: Methuen and Company. 1936. Pp. xi, 315. 15*s*.)

This book fills a great need in Scottish historiography. It is the only thoroughly comprehensive work on the subject. James I, the first capable monarch of the Stewart dynasty, is well known as the youthful king held captive in England for eighteen years, as the gallant lover of "The Kingis

Quair", and as the vigorous ruler cut off in his prime by assassination. Few understand what he attempted and accomplished in the thirteen years of his personal rule. The task Mr. Balfour-Melville set for himself was to write an authoritative life based on contemporary material, both manuscript and printed. He has collected a vast amount of information, arranged it in rather strict chronological order, and added thoughtful explanations and commentaries. All aspects of the reign, including negotiations for the release from captivity, ecclesiastical policy, foreign policy, constitutional innovations, efforts to improve economic conditions, and attacks on feudal privilege, have received careful attention. The result is an impressive work of sound scholarship and historical judgment. At times the minutiae and rigid chronological arrangement pall on the reader. The author is probably justified in rejecting topical arrangement of his material because of the many complicated interrelationships. Nevertheless, the best chapters are the last three, where unity of subject matter is observed.

The nature of the available source material has caused the book to be an account and estimate of a reign rather than a study of a personality. Professor Hannay and Sir Robert Rait have already covered the constitutional innovations of the period. Mr. Balfour-Melville's most valuable and original contributions lie in the detailed narrative of James's ecclesiastical policy, especially his relations with the papacy, and in the account of his relations with France and England. The king combined piety with a deep sense of responsibility for national interests as opposed to papal interests. His most serious quarrel with the pope arose from his attempts to prevent barratry, which impoverished Scotland by the drain of gold to the Roman curia. He played successfully on the difficulties of the English and of the French in order to evade the payment of his ransom to England, to form an alliance with France, cemented by the marriage of his daughter to the dauphin; and to remain at peace throughout most of his reign. Although money was never plentiful, he increased the royal revenues by close scrutiny of pensions, by confiscations, and by increased customs on a prospering trade. He made repeated efforts to break the power of the feudal nobility. "James saw the need of reform, he never hesitated to strike down obstruction and he succeeded for the time in giving his subjects a greater measure of domestic peace than at any other period of the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries" (p. 244). "The tragedy of James I lies in the wreck of his high purpose upon the stubborn individualism of the Scottish nobles in an age which saw throughout Europe the last recrudescence of feudalism before it withered in the dawn of modern times" (p. 280).

The book is attractive in format, is well annotated, and has an excellent bibliography and a good index.

Lancaster, Pa. HELEN G. STAFFORD.

The Bentivoglio of Bologna: A Study in Despotism. By CECILIA M. ADY, Research Fellow of St. Hugh's College, Oxford. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. xvi, 214. $5.00.)

EVERY fresh study of Italian despotism confirms the belief that the first student of the phenomenon was also the best. As a philosopher of the state, Machiavelli aimed to reduce the political situation under his eye to first principles, but as a strictly nominalist philosopher, he was careful to derive his principles from an abundance of briefly indicated instances. All that has remained for historians to do since Machiavelli is to conduct detailed studies of the instances on which the Florentine's amazingly penetrating generalizations rest. The present work is such a study, for it is a presentation of the despotism which the Bentivoglio family succeeded in establishing in Bologna in the fifteenth century. It is an authoritative study based on published and unpublished documents as well as on an exhaustive collection of printed and unprinted chronicles. All this material is carefully enumerated in an impressive bibliography.

Conditioned essentially by the same forces as the other city tyrants of the fifteenth century, the Bentivoglio of Bologna are the close kin of the Baglioni of Perugia, the Petrucci of Siena, the Sforza of Milan, the Medici of Florence, and a half score of other families tossed to the surface by the vast ferment within the free communes no longer able to maintain their republican systems in the face of an altered peninsular and European situation. Each town, however, has its own personality, each family aspiring to rule is confronted with a particular set of problems. It is precisely this variety which lends to Italian Renaissance history its incomparable excitement and color. A special complication the Bentivoglio had to face was that Bologna belonged to the pope, who, though feeble throughout the fifteenth century, never ceased to aspire to direct rule. By a politic mixture of subservience and daring the Bentivoglio, unanimously backed by a citizenry averse to clerical control, managed to keep a long succession of popes at arm's length. But the game could not continue forever. By the time Julius II mounted the papal throne the temporal power of the church had gained a certain consolidation. Consequently when in 1506 Julius firmly announced at Bologna that he was done with compromise, the curtain descended on Giovanni Bentivoglio with melodramatic suddenness. Strange to say, the author ascribes Giovanni's overthrow to his "weakness" of character. That is surely an underrating of the historical factor Machiavelli calls "fortune" and which we of today prefer to speak of with somewhat greater scientific aloofness as "forces". For the student of the period the most valuable parts of the book are the chapters dealing with the precarious, make-shift arrangements by which the Bentivoglio maintained control behind an elaborate façade of republican pretense. They afford an interesting comparison with the similar Medicean system at Florence. When Julius II,

clad in steel and acting as his own *condottiere,* at last descended on Bologna, tyrant and façade went down before him like the pasteboard articles they were. The Bolognese instance lends substance to Machiavelli's concluding and most triumphant proposition, that the only nationally acceptable solution of the many trivial local despots was an Italian super-despot.

The University of Chicago. FERDINAND SCHEVILL.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Érasme et l'Espagne: Recherches sur l'histoire spirituelle du XVI^e^ siècle. By MARCEL BATAILLON, maître des conférences à la Faculté des lettres d'Alger, docteur ès lettres. (Paris: E. Droz. 1937. Pp. lx, 904.)

FOR the past thirteen years Dr. Bataillon has been working in Spanish and Portuguese archives and libraries and has been setting forth the results of his researches in a large number of valuable essays, which have unfortunately attracted less attention than they deserved because of their publication in obscure Spanish, Portuguese, and Algerian journals and in co-operative books of homage to some master, books which have a small circulation. In addition to these essays he has discovered and edited a number of rare Spanish translations and imitations of Erasmus's works; but these admirable studies likewise failed to attract the attention of many scholars. Now at last, having given us the fruit of his labors in one volume of large size and of the highest quality, he will take his rightful place as one of the leading historians of his generation.

So dense is his book with new knowledge, so rich in thought, so original in its views, and so cautious and convincing in its arguments that it places in a fresh light the whole intellectual and religious history of Spain during the sixteenth century. A brief summary of the contents may give the reader of this review some idea, however inadequate, of the author's scope and conclusions. The first chapter exhibits the condition of the Spanish church in the early sixteenth century and of the reform led by Cardinal Ximénez. Among the topics here treated are the foundation of the University of Alcala and the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot. In order to promote his pious projects Ximénez invited Erasmus to Spain, an invitation of course declined by the liberty-loving Humanist. Already known in the peninsula through his original writings, he was presently attacked, and with great ferocity, by Zúñiga (Stunica) for his alleged errors in the edition and translation of the New Testament.

Though the condemnation of Luther made the path of the Spanish reformers difficult, they rallied to Erasmus, in whom they found the champion of peaceful piety and melioration without schism. In spite of himself he assumed a capital importance in Spain and became the leader of a

religious revolution as characteristic and as strong as was the Calvinist movement in France or the Socinian in Poland. "L'évangelisme espagnol, pour autant qu'il boit à des sources étrangères, puise dans Érasme son aliment presque exclusif". This is the principal thesis of M. Bataillon, and one that he proves conclusively. Those who know in Erasmus only the wit and the scholar neglect the warmth of his inward religion, which then attracted many of the finer spirits of Europe, weary of Roman corruption and repelled by Lutheran violence.

This characteristic Spanish revival was Illuminism; its textbook was the *Enchiridion*, which, with other tracts of Erasmus, was translated into Spanish and then widely read, though now rare because efficiently destroyed later by the Inquisition. From the year 1527 till the end of the reign of Charles the works of Erasmus in translation enjoyed in Spain a popularity unequaled in any other country. Nor was his influence confined to the readers of his books. In Vergara, in Maldonado, in Juan and Alonso de Valdés, he found his truest apostles. Opposition and suppression began almost as soon as discipleship and propaganda. A great ecclesiastical congress at Valladolid in 1527 occupied itself largely in refuting and attacking Erasmus on the ground that his doctrines were those of Luther. In an impassioned speech Diego de Gouvea quoted the famous epigram, so much quoted since, that "Erasmus had laid the eggs and Luther had hatched the chickens." This epigram he attributed to "Brother Hemundus", whose identity M. Bataillon is unable to discover, though he rightly says that the epigrammatist must have been a German Franciscan. It is rather odd that though every writer on the Reformation has borrowed the winged words, no one, as far as I remember, has inquired, or discovered, who first said them. A careful comparison of two Erasmian letters, little known because published in obscure places, makes it probable that the author of the phrase was Nicholas of Herborn. In an epistle written to Sinapius on July 31, 1534 (published by Stähelin in a university program in 1887), the Humanist quotes this and three other epigrams against him by a certain unnamed preacher. In a letter to Jean de Pins, November 13, 1534 (published in a life of Erasmus in 1923), he says: "Nicolaus Herborn, Franciscanus . . . edidit sermones . . . non in aliud nisi ut acerrimis conviciis me aspergeret". The question may now be asked M. Bataillon whether "Hemundus" could possibly be a corruption of "Herbornus". Or, was Gouvea thinking of Egmond?

After running a beneficent course, Erasmian Illuminism finally succumbed to the Catholic reaction. The decrees of Trent settled many questions of doubtful orthodoxy, and the scourge of the Inquisition fell heavily on the backs of many would-be mystical reformers. Though in part crushed, in part the movement was only driven underground. More cautiously, pseudonymously, and clandestinely the old doctrines appeared in new disguises. Almost every Spanish religious leader felt the influence of Erasmus

in one form or another, whether he was a great heresiarch like Servetus or a great saint like Loyola or John of the Cross.

Nor was the influence of the Humanist unimportant in secular fields. In a fascinating chapter M. Bataillon traces first the part played by Erasmus in imperial politics and then the influence of his *Institutio principis Christiani.* Marked also was his impression on the drama, on the picaresque novel, and on the development of the Castilian tongue. The expert performer in Latinity, though he himself would use no other tongue but that of ancient Rome, once wrote: "Those who know Italian, Spanish, and French unanimously affirm that there is in these languages, corrupt as they are, a grace unattainable by Latin". Many writers down to and including Cervantes learned from the Humanist. Even in secular matters, however, he was opposed and suppressed by authority. How large was his position is testified by the space devoted to him in the Spanish *Indices expurgatorii,* which is greater than that devoted to any other writer.

No summary can give an idea of the wealth of learning and of suggestion in the work under review. Though it is long, it is not a word too much. Every student of European culture and religion during the crisis of the sixteenth century will find in it matter of great delight and copious instruction. That other scholars may not, in some detail, amplify or qualify our knowledge of the Spanish Renaissance and Reformation would be too much to assert; that all students of the subject will build upon M. Bataillon's solid and brilliant study is a safe prediction.

Cornell University. PRESERVED SMITH.

European Civilization: Its Origin and Development. By various contributors under the direction of EDWARD EYRE. Volume V, *Economic History of Europe since the Reformation.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. vi, 1328. $7.50.)

THE first half of this volume lives up to the expectations raised by the title and consists of ten chapters on various aspects of the economic history of Europe, including: the economic effects of the Reformation; the European peasantry; agriculture since 1750; industry; population; money, finance, and banking since the Renaissance; and the development of economic theory. Though there is no adequate discussion of international trade, of transportation, of industrial and financial combinations (six pages only), of business crises (four pages), or of the labor movement (two pages), and though the postponement of the subject of European expansion overseas to Volume VII gives the work a peculiarly truncated and provincial effect, still these essays present useful summaries of the more available secondary material, especially in the case of the first part of the chapter on population by A. M. Carr-Saunders.

Throughout the volume the role of England is overemphasized, since

that country receives about as much attention as all the lands of Continental Europe together. Most of the chapters are written from a point of view which is Catholic, but obtrusively so only on occasion. There are relatively few factual errors, though Thomas Mun is spoken of as writing in 1664 (p. 104) and Jean Bodin in 1597 (p. 352), the guild regime is depicted as almost universal in medieval Europe (p. 254), and Colbert's tariff of 1667 is declared to have introduced high rates on "practically all imports" (p. 655), etc. Some of the errors of interpretation are more serious. The obstructive activity of the Turks rather than the Venetian monopoly is advanced as the chief reason for the search for new routes to the East (pp. 19-20). The regulation of economic life in seventeenth century Boston (pp. 55-56) and the new attitude toward the poor in England (pp. 96 ff.) are attributed to Calvinism, though both were more than evident in contemporary France. The account of the Russian peasantry, 1600-1914 (pp. 164 ff.), is so highly colored as to be almost fantastic. The only causes given for the industrial revolution are the opening up of new markets and the development of "mass machine methods of production" (pp. 292-94).

The section on money, finance, and banking by A. V. Judges gathers together many important facts on prices, debasement, accounting, coinage, government debts, credit, etc. But it merely presents one thing after another with no attempt to give a connected, synthetic account of the rise of capitalism and capitalistic techniques. In fact, the whole volume suffers from a lack of synthesis. It is merely a collection of more or less competent discussions of a series of more or less related topics. Even where the editor could easily have improved the unity of the work, he has failed to do so, *e.g.*, the repetition of the discussion of agricultural co-operatives (pp. 172-79, 231-35). Limitations of space forced most of the contributors to be sketchy, but they can scarcely have compelled A. E. Feavearyear, in his chapter on economic theory, to dismiss the historical school with the barest mention and to omit entirely the marginalism and neoclassicism of the last half century. Most of the chapters would have been more valuable if, like the first and the ninth, they had included select bibliographies.

The last half of the book is a curious agglomeration of unrelated and inappropriate material. A long chapter entitled "Society" by Michael de la Bedoyere consists of a rambling and repetitious discussion of some of the ideas of Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, Bentham, J. S. Mill, and Marx. This author's judgment of the work of Marx, that it "consisted in little more than a constant reiteration of his convictions, now in metaphysical, now in ethical, now in oratorical language" (p. 865), seems somewhat less than profound. The succeeding sections treat administration, English criminal law, armies and navies, and the idea of internationalism, with little or no mention of economic implications.

The first ten essays should be of use to the reader interested in the

topics treated rather than in a broad, synthetic survey of European economic history. The editor may have had reasons of his own for including the last five (539 pages, forty-two per cent of the book).

Amherst College. CHARLES WOOLSEY COLE.

Paradoxes inédits du Seigneur de Malestroit touchant les monnoyes avec la response du President De la Tourette. Edited by LUIGI EINAUDI. [Collezione di scritti inediti o rari di economisti.] (Turin: Guilio Einaudi. 1937. Pp. 164.)

BECAUSE his *Paradoxes* elicited Jean Bodin's *Response,* Malestroit has been accorded a safe but unenviable place in history; he was the unseeing one who failed to realize that American treasure was upsetting the economic structure of sixteenth century Europe. His brief *Paradoxes* alleged that prices had not risen for three centuries; progressive debasement had merely led to the proffer of less and less goods for less and less bullion. Bodin countered with the suggestion that new supplies of specie materially complicated the problem, although he admitted that there was no way to combat this new force.

The discovery by Einaudi of another Malestroit manuscript and a reply to it (and to three unfound *cahiers* of Malestroit) by an official of the Cours des monnaies rudely destroys the simplicity of the old story. For instead of a single controversy between Malestroit and Bodin, the new documents attest the existence of a three-sided dispute, with Malestroit and Bodin disagreeing as to whether the rise in prices had a real or nominalistic explanation but agreeing that monetary reform was imperative to abate price changes, thereby joining forces against the experts of the Cours des monnaies. The spokesman for this body was De la Tourette, who ironically rejected the unsolicited advice of the interfering theorists.

In order to clarify this important episode in French monetary history Einaudi has reprinted Malestroit's *Paradoxes* (1566), followed this with the newly discovered *Mémoires sur le faict des monnoyes* (1567), after which he has printed De la Tourette's *Response* (1567). An eighty-four page introduction, in Italian, precedes the documents, dealing comprehensively and critically with the tangled monetary problems which elicited the writings of Malestroit, De la Tourette, and Bodin.

The controversy revolved around remedies for the exodus of specie, for debased and heterogeneous circulating coins, for high prices and low incomes, for chronic fiscal difficulties. Malestroit laid the blame on the monetary experts, alleging that adherence to a 12-1 mint ratio would harmonize the French bimetallic coinage with the world market for metals and with foreign mints. His doctrinaire insistence on Plato's ratio laid him open to attack, and De la Tourette was merciless. Yet there was interwoven with Malestroit's naïve faith in a monetary panacea a competent grasp of

a fundamental theory: that a stable money of account must be the desideratum of monetary policy and that mint practice must keep circulating coins at parity with the money of account. Einaudi has demonstrated that Malestroit was probably nearer the truth than Bodin: for the long sweep of history it was debasement rather than abundance of specie which explained the rise of prices, and only in the closing years of the span of time covered by Raveau's figures does specie inflow into Europe predominate as a price-raising force. Bodin admitted that there was no remedy for this conjuncture and therefore centered his reforms on currency simplification. Unknown to him when he asked Malestroit publicly, in 1568, to outline remedies, Malestroit had already recommended to the Cours des monnaies a plan for monetary reform that agreed with Bodin's recommendation, except for details of seigneurage, that the weird system of legal tender valuations on heterogeneous coins be replaced by uniform gold and uniform silver pieces.

The ensemble of documents, introduction, and glossary again gives convincing proof of Einaudi's scholarship. To our stock of historical materials he has added two important items, which he has analyzed with real theoretical insight. The theoretical distillate of this historical episode he has then employed to illuminate modern monetary problems.

New York University. E. A. J. Johnson.

Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland. By G. D. Henderson, Regius Professor of Church History, University of Aberdeen. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1937. Pp. 311. $4.25.)

One of the weaknesses of the American historical profession is its tendency to neglect the civilizations of Wales and Scotland. When we deal with British history we make it almost exclusively the story of England and the overseas empire. If any attention is given to the lesser areas of the British Isles, it is to Ireland, whose troubles form so large a part of English political history. Yet both Wales and Scotland have had distinctive cultures of their own, and the northern country in particular has also played a vital role in the history of England. Without the Scotch religious disturbances of the 1630's it can be reasonably argued that after 1629 the English parliament would have gone the way of the French estates general. Thus the rise of British liberalism would have been indefinitely postponed—though the point is passed over very lightly in the textbooks, most of which are compiled under English influence. A volume such as the one under review therefore deserves a cordial welcome in this country.

The work is a collection of careful essays incorporating much material from unpublished sources. Though most of the studies have appeared previously, the periodicals which carried them do not circulate widely on this side of the Atlantic, and three of the chapters are entirely new. One of

these is a survey of the whole covenanting movement and might well be read first, in lieu of an introductory chapter on the general church history of the time. Another, on the influence of Bishop Patrick Forbes of Aberdeen, describes a respectable mid-century Episcopalian party, which was much more moderate than Laud and his followers. There is a chapter on foreign religious influences in Scotland, and others on particular aspects of this subject, such as early Scotch Independency and the effect of the Synod of Dort and the French Quietist movement on the area north of the Tweed. Essays on church worship and government, the Bible, the sermon, and the theological learning of the time deal with internal religious developments. The last study in this group also affords a useful parallel to S. E. Morison's study of the university curriculum in the British Isles in this period.

The volume inevitably has the defects of its composition. It is occasionally repetitious, and it cannot properly support its general title. The emphasis is on party, church, school, and foreign influences. Home training and personal piety are almost entirely neglected. There is ample room for the treatment of such topics as the rearing of children, conversion, and religious experience. An essay on the religious conditions in northeastern Scotland after the Revolution suggests the predominant interest of the author in the region immediately surrounding his university. While one of the most pardonable of faults is a fondness for old Aberdeen with its King's College and St. Machar's Cathedral—for there are few more charming spots—this predilection does not give balance to a general work on Scotch religious life. But if the reader will remember that Presbyterianism was the usual religion of Scotland in this period, that it commanded the almost unanimous support of the south and west, and that the Independent movement in seventeenth century Scotland was not confined to Aberdeen, he will find this an exceedingly useful work.

The University of Chicago. M. M. KNAPPEN.

The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, with an Introductionn, Notes, and a Sketch of his Life. By WILBUR CORTEZ ABBOTT, Francis Lee Higginson Professor of History in Harvard University, with the assistance of Catherine D. Crane. Volume I, *1599-1649*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1937. Pp. xix, 759. $5.00.)

PROFESSOR Abbott, a fellow-student of the reviewer at Balliol College, Oxford, more than forty years ago, has now added to his *Bibliography of Oliver Cromwell*—a book that must always lie on the desk of those who study Cromwell—a complete and exhaustive edition of his writings and speeches. It will run, eventually, to four massive volumes and will contain, in addition to the 318 items published by Carlyle and the 185 added by Mrs. Lomas, some 700 new items, of which 550 have been already printed and 150 are entirely new. These simple figures will give some idea of the

range of Professor Abbott's investigations and of the massive character of the monument which he has built. But he has not only added new material; he has also arranged the whole in simple chronological sequence, so that the student (who had hitherto to consult, first Carlyle's original collection, and then his Appendix, and then the additions of Mrs. Lomas) has now everything spread in its proper order before his eyes.

This is a *monumentum;* but the matter does not end there. Like Carlyle, but with the greater objectivity and the larger historical sweep of a trained historian, Professor Abbott has set his matter in the framework of a running and brief narrative. His work is far from being a simple collection of documents. It is also an interpretation of the period of Cromwell's life and of Cromwell himself. It is an interpretation which makes good reading. No doubt the four volumes of *Writings and Speeches* will be conned mainly by scholars. But it is to be hoped that the general reader will find his way to them. One can well imagine him reading Professor Abbott's arresting and brief narrative with a steady attention and dipping from time to time into the less forbidding of the documents. If he is wise enough to follow that method, he will get a more real and more profound view of this greatest of all Englishmen who have acted on the public stage than he is likely to get from most of the set biographies. Cromwell grows in all his detail as one reads—stage by stage, period by period—and ever and again we see him writing or hear him speaking for himself. In a word, this is a monumental biography of Cromwell as well as being, for long years to come, the "definitive" edition of his writings and speeches.

This first volume, the only one which has yet appeared, carries Cromwell to the year 1649 and the age of 50. But the preface to the first volume is also the preface to the whole, and it is only just to the author to explain the scheme of the whole work, as it is set out in the preface, before proceeding to a consideration of its first part. Professor Abbott's object has been "to set down as fully and as impartially as possible what Cromwell actually wrote and said, with such comment as may make those writings and sayings more intelligible in the light of their time and circumstances, and our own". In this way, from these materials and "from a small infinity of other sources", he has sought to draw "some explanation, however inadequate, of the Protector's action and his thoughts". He draws especial attention to that part of the whole work which concerns the record of the Protectorate and especially its foreign policy. This part will comprehend a tolerably complete corpus of the Cromwellian state papers; it will assemble, for the first time, letters and dispatches to foreign powers, instructions to diplomats and commanders, and a variety of commissions and orders. It will also contain, what will also be welcome, a list of Cromwellian officials.

The first volume covers ground which is familiar and explored. Only Professor Firth could have appraised it adequately. Familiar, however, as is

the ground covered, this volume nonetheless contains a good deal of new matter: in particular it deals very fully (and this is a welcome and apposite feature, in these days of the interpretation of Cromwell as a "dictator") with the details of Oliver's activities in parliament. (It is a curious thing, by the way, that the borough of Cambridge, which twice made him a member of parliament and which he represented for thirteen years, should never have commemorated the greatest of its members. Burke has his statue in Bristol; Cromwell has none in Cambridge.) In Professor Abbott's own narrative, which naturally and necessarily occupies a larger part of the first than it is likely to do of the second volume, some chapters deserve especial notice. Among these are the introductory chapter, which deals with the outbreak of the civil war, and that part of the last chapter which deals with the execution of the king. The latest biographer of Cromwell, Maurice Ashley, in his *Oliver Cromwell: The Conservative Dictator,* remarks in his introduction that he notes "that on details even Professor Abbott nods occasionally". The present reviewer has noticed no noddings of that lively head, and having written on Cromwell himself, in a very small way, he is simply and plainly grateful to the balanced scholar who—noting that Cromwell has been adopted as a champion by liberals, apotheosized by revolutionists, and, on the other side, hailed as a dictator by their opponents—just seeks to record what he actually was. If one may count any faults, they are but little shadows. Typographically, it might have been wise to print Cromwell himself in large print and the commentator in small, as Carlyle did, rather than vice versa; but even this, on second thought, is dubious in view of the printer's tradition. In point of style it may be suggested that the commentator (perhaps using the method of dictation) has allowed his commentary to run to no small length and to fall occasionally into grammatical slips; but the other side of this defect is the liveliness of the narrative and the sense which the reader gains of a liberal and detailed scene. References are abundant and very rarely omitted; one should be appended for the last passage on page 65, and on page 722 (where a striking passage is quoted from Calvin in favor of resistance, which seems definitely to contradict his general view of nonresistance) some reference and some explanation are certainly to be desired. On one point of fact the reviewer would venture to raise a query. Was John White of Dorchester (a Wykehamist and afterwards a fellow of New College, Oxford, who held the living of Holy Trinity in our English Dorchester) really the leader of the movement which led to the "great migration" to Massachusetts in 1629 from Cambridgeshire and the country round? This is suggested on page 74; but it is possible that John Winthrop (of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Eastern Counties) was the real leader. These matters, however, belong to the old and inveterate dispute between Oxford and Cambridge. Let them be; and let the last word be a word of sincere

and warm congratulation to an old Oxford man (of whom Harvard may well be proud) on the great and lasting monument which he has erected to the greatest of Cambridge men—Oliver Cromwell.

ERNEST BARKER.

Cambridge University.

Predecessors of Adam Smith: The Growth of British Economic Thought. By E. A. J. JOHNSON, Cornell University. [Prentice-Hall Economics Series.] (New York: Prentice-Hall. 1937. Pp. xii, 426. $3.50.)

DR. Johnson, who has become known by his studies in the beginnings of American economic literature, now enters the well-trodden field of early British thought. Disclaiming any attempt to write a general history of economics, he limits himself to a study of ten selected thinkers, together with four special topics illustrated by a wider range of authors. He excludes the writers on monetary theory and on foreign trade because they have been well discussed by others. He has concerned himself simply with erecting "a set of guide posts" and with "constructing doctrinal mosaics of little things".

In this modest venture he has succeeded, even though some would naturally differ with him in the list of representative thinkers. No one, indeed, will contest the selection of Malynes and Misselden, of Mun and Petty, of Hume and Steuart. But it is not quite apparent why Charles King, the propagandist, should be preferred to Defoe or Massie, or why Postlethwayt, the publicist, should be preferred to Davenant or others. And while it is true that in the four supplementary chapters devoted to "Land and Labor", "Art and Ingenious Labor", "Idleness and Luxury", and "The Export of Work" a number of writers are quoted, it would have been possible to select a number of additional topics and to quote from other equally worthwhile authors.

There are two points that deserve special mention. In his selection of writers there is one new name, that of Grew, the scientist. Nehemiah Grew, who died in 1712, was a member of the Royal Society and is well known as a chemist, botanist, and physicist, and as one who entered the lists of philosophy as an opponent of Spinoza. Dr. Johnson describes his *Meanes of the most Ample Encrease of the Wealth and Strength of England*, written around 1707 and still in manuscript in the Lansdowne Collection of the British Museum. This contains an interesting program of possible improvements in the land, the industry, the maritime resources, and the population of England and Wales. Familiar with the economic literature of the day, Grew advances a number of common-sense suggestions designed to promote the prosperity of his country. From the description given by Dr. Johnson it is clear that Grew's study deserves to be published.

While the discovery of Grew is a noteworthy achievement, the chapter

on Hales the Humanist is less commendable. Dr. Johnson should not have left his readers ignorant of the recent discussion which has thrown serious doubts on Miss Lamond's ascription of *A Compendious or Briefe Examination* to Hales. In the *Écrits notables sur la monnaie*, published in 1934 in the new edition of *La collection des principaux économistes*, M. Jean Yves le Branchu includes a translation of the work in the second volume. In the preface to the first volume he subjects Miss Lamond's arguments to a detailed scrutiny and comes to the well-supported conclusion that the real author of the 1549 work was Sir Thomas Smythe and that the "W. S." of the 1581 publication was his nephew, William Smythe. Unless further light is thrown on the matter by a more careful study of the newly discovered manuscript copy of the original work in the Hatfield Collection, it would seem that John Hales can no longer be described as the author. That Dr. Johnson should have failed to call attention to this entire discussion constitutes a grave omission in what is in other respects an interesting and well-written work.

Columbia University. EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN.

Marlborough: His Life and Times. By WINSTON S. CHURCHILL. Volume V, *1705-1708.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1937. Pp. 607. $4.50.)

Now that this biography has reached its penultimate volume, its merits and shortcomings may be weighed with greater presumption of fairness than when the work was in its earlier stages. There is still to come the severest test of objectivity, the story of Marlborough's fall from power and the peace with France, but even in this volume, with Marlborough triumphing at Ramillies and Oudenarde, objectivity does not seem to be Mr. Churchill's peculiar virtue. It is, perhaps, something of which he holds no high opinion. Accuracy by all means, but not the mildew of indifference or the dessication of history into sociological or chemical formulas. For Mr. Churchill history is the great man in action, nobly surpassing himself. "How vain", he exclaims, "are those writers in so many lands who suppose that the great minds of the world in their supreme activities are twisted or swayed by sordid or even personal aims. These, indeed, may clog their footsteps along the miry road of life; but soaring on the wings of victory all fall away" (p. 171). Admiration of Marlborough and indignation at his detractors determine the tone of this work. They are a team of emotions difficult to restrain to a moderate pace. More than once in this, as in the earlier volumes, they get out of hand, as when Mr. Churchill observes: "Although no scholar, and for all his comical spelling, he wrote a rugged, forceful English worthy of the Shakespeare on which his education was mainly founded" (p. 7); or when he refers to Marlborough as "the greatest man alive" (p. 218); or when he attributes the end of French hegemony to "one man and three battles" (p. 538), forgetting the long toil and indomit-

able patience of the architect of the Grand Alliance, William III. For blind admiration Mr. Churchill is too intelligent, but to the reviewer it seems that most of the admissions damaging to Marlborough fall in the preface, the text being largely reserved to his glories. Yet Marlborough, more than most heroes, needs to be seen realistically and not forever in bronze on a high horse. Nowhere in this volume does one find criticism as just and searching as Trevelyan's: "He had the qualities which William lacked for he could not only plan, but win a world war; but he was to fail where William had succeeded, for he could not make a world peace. Indeed, he can scarcely be said to have tried." On the answer to the question of whether Marlborough tried will depend, it is probable, the ultimate verdict of history—not on Marlborough's greatness but on the quality of that greatness: Was he a supremely successful general, organizer, diplomat, and minister, or was he besides, like Washington, a wise, self-abnegating, and heroic statesman? Mr. Churchill has deferred his answer to this question to his final volume, and one should not anticipate it, but to the civilian mind an ominous exhilaration over war flames in Mr. Churchill's text, as if war existed for its own sake, and peace must give sureties for good behavior. On what other grounds could Queen Anne's aversion to the war party in parliament in 1708 be denounced as "utterly wrong"? And from what other soil could spring Mr. Churchill's conviction that her "personal interventions hampered the prosecution of the war, and delayed and eventually frustrated a victorious peace" (p. 464)? Evidently Utrecht was not sufficiently victorious, and Mr. Churchill would have preferred a peace dictated in the Hall of the Mirrors. Why else would he maintain that "Queen Anne had now [1708] become her own worst enemy" (p. 540)?

The years 1705-1708 are famous in the annals of England. Mr. Churchill has little of importance to add, in matters of fact, to what has already been established by Coxe, Taylor, and Trevelyan. As in the earlier volumes it is his fresh point of view, his light touch, his zest and wit, the ease with which he moves to and fro between war and politics of the eighteenth and those of the twentieth century, which distinguish Mr. Churchill's narrative and delight the reader. His remark that after the Regency Bill "the Tories lay like beetles on their backs" (p. 35) is the best description of political impotence since Disraeli likened her majesty's government to "a row of extinct volcanoes". As memorable is a pithy comment on the exodus of Charles XII from history: "The Russian excursion had removed that formidable irrelevancy from the scene" (p. 540). For these and other reasons readers will not repine that Marlborough will come to six volumes instead of the five originally contemplated by the author.

Vassar College. VIOLET BARBOUR.

Poor Fred: The People's Prince. By Sir George Young. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. xxxi, 232. $5.00.)

Royal George: A Study of King George III, his Experiment in Monarchy, his Decline and Retirement, with a View of Society, Politics, and Historic Events during his Reign. By C. E. Vulliamy. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1937. Pp. 318. $4.00.)

Sir George Young's arresting life of Frederick, Prince of Wales, son of George II and father of George III, avoids the common pitfall of accepting nineteenth century interpretations of eighteenth century political history. Fresh examination of the sources has resulted in a new version of the life of Prince Frederick—of his character, of his relations with his parents, and of his political motives.

The charge of writing history for political purposes Sir George does not even seek to escape. In his introduction he frankly states his views and by admitting their influence disarms the critic. In "the present reaction back to a collectivist corporate society and away from individualist capitalism —back to personal government and away from party government", he declares, "the authority of the Crown is still our best salvation from dictatorship. Moreover, the precedents of George II and Prince Frederick in respect of personal participation of the Crown in a crisis of reconstruction are still of interest and importance if properly interpreted" (p. v). In years to come historians may find the introduction quite as useful in interpreting the twentieth century as the body of the biography for the history of the eighteenth. At any rate, the author gives due warning that *Poor Fred* should be read in the light of twentieth century facts and theories.

According to Sir George Young, Prince Frederick was not the fool and scapegrace described by many prejudiced contemporaries and undiscriminating historians. He was, on the contrary, the true patriot, practicing the teachings of Bolingbroke. Had the prince lived to become the "Patriot King", politicians more brilliant than he might have achieved political reforms which would have changed the course of history, effecting new relationships in the empire and correcting economic and social ills at home. To admit Sir George's claim that injustice has been done the prince is not difficult, in view of the evidence produced; to accept the author's ultimate conclusions is less easy, for the factors that shape history are too complex to permit ready adoption of the theory that one man, even a king, could have changed forever the main stream of events.

The immediate effects of the prince's influence are, however, undeniable. Although he was in theory averse to parties, he was instrumental in their development. An opposition led by the heir apparent was not to be accused of disloyalty to the reigning house and therefore acquired strength and safety. As it was only a step from toleration to the recognition of his

majesty's opposition, in contradistinction to his majesty's government, the basis was laid in this period for the two-party system.

On the whole Sir George's approach tends to produce a feeling of confidence and a sense of agreement. To what extent he has exhausted all possible sources for this work is not obvious, for he makes no parade of scholarship; but that he has industriously investigated published memoirs and correspondence, contemporary newspapers, and many manuscripts of the period is certain. The occasional omission of references, however, renders some of his statements unconvincing. For instance, it is not clear why he accepts the gossip that Horace Walpole was the son of Lord Hervey's brother, Carr (p. 2). One curious slip occurs in apparently interpreting Frederick's admonition to his son, "Be allways kind to the Electorate", as if it were not Hanover but the voters of England to whom reference was made (pp. 174 and 192). The author's suggestion that the princess may have poisoned Frederick, admittedly without historical foundation, might in time become a real disservice to history (p. 217). Such hypotheses are prone to be repeated as established fact and give rise to legends which distort our knowledge of the past.

As regards readability, *Poor Fred* may be recommended wholeheartedly. The facility with which the author turns a phrase, his adroit use of words, his delicate humor in retelling the anecdotes of an age that was far from delicate succeed in producing a refreshing and altogether entertaining biography.

In contrast to *Poor Fred, Royal George* offers no new evidence and presents no new interpretation of men or events. This biography of George III even fails to leave any clear impression of the man or the monarch. It is, for the most part, written in the orthodox tradition, a tradition which was established when much of the material concerning George III was not available to the historian. Mr. Vulliamy cites, to be sure, in addition to many other published works, Fortescue's edition of the correspondence and the very useful collection by Dobrée, but the small volume edited by the latter gives one an infinitely clearer comprehension of George III than this latest biography.

Wilson College. D. M. Clark.

Les exilés acadiens en France au XVIII^e siècle et leur établissement en Poitou. Par Ernest Martin, ancien professeur à l'Université Dalhousie à Halifax, professeur agrégé d'anglais au Lycée de Poitiers. (Paris: Librairie Hachette. 1936. Pp. 333. 32 fr.)

L'Évangéline de Longfellow et la suite merveilleuse d'un poème. Par Ernest Martin. (*Ibid.* Pp. 376. 35 fr.)

Since these two theses for the doctorate in France seem merely to testify to the abiding interest in the Acadian tragedy, there is some danger that the

important contribution of the first of them to knowledge of physiocratic experiment in France may be overlooked. The three to four thousand Acadian exiles and ex-prisoners who reached France between 1755 and 1764 were the objects of the sustained solicitude of Louis XV until his death and the recipients of modest governmental pensions. They were also in demand by seekers for man power—by Choiseul for the remaining French colonies, by Great Britain for Nova Scotia and Canada, and by promoters and seigneurs for resettlement projects in France and elsewhere. Probably the first person to think of using the Acadians for physiocratic ends was Jacques Imbert de la Rochette, agent of the French ambassador at London in dealing with the Acadian prisoners in England and link between the French physiocrats and the British agronomists whom they admired. (Two of his revealing commonplace books form Phillipps MS. 11546 in the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.)

The Acadians were victims first of an effort by Brittany to plant about four hundred of them on Belle-Ile-sur-Mer. Having received, resented, and finally rejected their first taste of grasping French feudalism, the general body asked assistance to join their compatriots in Louisiana or Miquelon. Failing to secure this, small groups had begun to steal away back to British Nova Scotia, when about fifteen hundred of them were half-persuaded, half-forced, to take part in the physiocratic model colony at Châtellerault in Poitou, founded after 1762 by the Marquis de Pérusse des Cars, guided by the agricultural expert Sarcey de Sutières, and temporarily rescued from collapse by the government, which expended over a million *livres* from 1773 to 1779 in an effort to give physiocratic agriculture its chance.

Thanks partly to the Acadian share in the experiment, Professor Martin has succeeded in collecting enough evidence to describe an enterprise which is notable as a commentary on physiocracy, as the beginning of reclamation of briar-bound lands made waste by past wars and the expulsion of the Huguenots, and as a precise demonstration of how impossible agricultural reform was before the abolition of feudalism. While it is clear that the Acadians had become somewhat demoralized and their traditional stubbornness intensified by their grievous vicissitudes since 1749 and by ten years "on relief", and while their tradition of land tenure, and indeed of life in general, was utterly alien to that of France, they were emotionally loyal to the crown and had its promise of establishment as privileged small proprietors. The collapse of the Châtellerault colony was therefore only partly owing to an attempt to put back the clock for North American agricultural frontiersmen; what is significant in European history is the account of how rivals and neighbors of the marquis demolished his experiment by refusing to modify the ancient feudal structure. The colony was disrupted by a hostile agent in 1775, its Acadians were pensioned for another three years, and in

1785 about fifteen hundred sailed with official assistance to join three thousand compatriots in Spanish Louisiana. In the Baton Rouge, Bayou Lafourche, and Bayou Tèche regions their descendants today number about five hundred thousand. France retained about one thousand Acadians at the ports, about sixteen families at Belle-Ile, and about twelve families in the farmsteads of "la Ligne Acadienne" in Poitou. The necessitous were pensioned until 1799, and as late as 1822-23 the Restoration government investigated the possible needs of their descendants.

The true renaissance of the Acadian people, however, took place in Louisiana, the Maritime Provinces, New England, and Quebec during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and in it Longfellow's *Evangeline* (1847) played an enormous part. Professor Martin's second volume is in part an acute, detailed literary criticism of poet and poem, revealing an important new source for Longfellow, and in part an examination of the historical validity of the poem; but its principal theme is to reveal how powerfully *Evangeline* operated to focus and stimulate the particularism of about a million Acadians and to personify it to readers in some thirteen languages. This history of a "national" resurgence has a number of undignified aspects, which are recognized and realistically handled by the author.

Beyond these general contributions to history Professor Martin adds little to the vexed history of the Acadians. Happily, however, although his studies have been conducted under the eye of M. Émile Lauvrière, he has not followed the emotional canons of his predecessor and patron but has done his utmost to be objective. His account of the Acadian tragedy is rather too brief to achieve this completely satisfactorily; indeed some of its apparent objectivity is achieved by neglecting inconvenient evidence, as could be shown in detail if space permitted. Fortunately, however, this does not greatly affect the two excellently presented main theses described above. It might be added that both volumes contain interesting *pièces justificatives*, photographs, and plans.

Columbia University. J. B. Brebner.

Aventure: Bonaparte en Italie, 1796-1797. Par Guglielmo Ferrero. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1936. Pp. vi, 294. 15 fr.)

In this book Guglielmo Ferrero, the distinguished historian of Rome, has turned his attention from ancient times to one of the most interesting episodes of modern history. In narrating this story in the history of France, Italy, and Napoleon he has defined his subject broadly. He not only relates and interprets the military operations of those two dramatic years but also their diplomatic and political repercussions. He treats, consequently, not only the strategy and battles of the period but the relations of Bonaparte with the

French Directory, Austria, and the Italian states, and the gradual organization of the conquered territory into the Cisalpine Republic.

In selecting this topic for his new work the author ventures into a field in which there are already a great many works which should be mentioned in even a brief survey of the secondary literature of the subject. A list of the general accounts of this episode should include the factual narrative in the eighth, ninth, and tenth volumes of Jomini's *Histoire critique et militaire des guerres de la révolution,* the critical analyses of Clausewitz in *Der Feldzug von 1796 in Italien,* Bouvier's large volume, *Napoléon en Italie,* on events down to the occupation of Milan, the undocumented and more popular narratives of two American army officers—H. H. Sargent, *Napoleon Bonaparte's First Campaign,* and T. A. Dodge, *Napoleon: A History of the Art of War*—the voluble and at times uncritical work, *Napoleons Feldzug in Italien und Oesterreich, 1796-97,* of the German enthusiast, F. M. Kircheisen, A. Pingaud, *La domination française dans l'Italie du nord, 1796-1805,* and the introduction of E. Driault's, *Napoléon en Italie, 1800-1812.* In addition there should be considered such monographs on special phases of the subject as G. B. McClellan, *Venice and Bonaparte,* A. Bonnefon, *La chute de la république de Venice,* P. Gaffarel, *Bonaparte et les républiques italiennes, 1796-1799,* G. Bourgin and J. Godechot, *L'Italie et Napoléon, 1796-1814,* J. du Teil, *Rome, Naples, et le Directoire . . . 1796-97,* and P. Bodereau, *Bonaparte à Ancone.*

The contribution of Ferrero to this much written about subject lies in his interpretations of events rather than in his widening of our factual knowledge. In contrast with most authorities, for example, he believes that the young general was the docile agent of the Directors until late in the campaign. He thinks that the plan of campaign sprang from the co-operative efforts of a group of young officers rather than from the brain of Bonaparte. He denies that the battle of Montenotte really separated the Austrians and the Sardinians. He emphasizes that the dispatches of the British and Austrian ministers at Turin prove that the Sardinian government was thinking of withdrawing from the war long before the campaign of 1796 started. He points out that Bonaparte reverted to the methods of the period from 1500 to 1650. He asserts that the work of political reconstruction was necessary to save the peninsula from anarchy.

The author has used some new sources. He has dug new and pertinent material out of the Archives nationales and has exploited for the first time the *Recueil des actes du directoire exécutif* of A. Debidour.

There are, of course, certain defects in the work. The author makes the task of checking his sources difficult by omitting the initials of all the writers and editors whom he mentions. Occasionally he gives an important quotation without indicating its origin. He has, however, carefully digested

his sources, set forth the pertinent facts in such a way as to show with unusual clearness their time and causal relationships, and reflected incisively on their significance.

University of Wisconsin. C. P. Higby.

Hermann von Boyen, der Begründer der allgemeinen Wehrpflicht: Der Mann und sein Werk. Von Gerhard Scholtz. (Berlin: Verlag für Kulturpolitik. 1936. Pp. 395. 5.50 M.)

There are certain obvious parallels between the periods 1806-15 and 1918-36 in German history. Both began with military disaster and consequent helplessness and demoralization; both witnessed the rebuilding of the military machine despite the wish of the late enemy to prevent it; in both the spirit of nationalism grew again while military service (*Wehrpflicht*) became the duty of every subject. Naturally, national-socialist writers, representing the present regime as one of national awakening and regeneration, like to emphasize these parallels and to claim for their leaders spiritual kinship with Stein, Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and Boyen.

Hermann von Boyen is a logical subject for a biography written with such a purpose. First and always he was a soldier; but he was also a public-spirited citizen. Although himself a child and creature of the old-type professional army, he helped to create the national army based on universal service. Always interested in education in the old army, he shared Humboldt's conception of the new as an integral part of the educational, or youth-training, system of the nation. The author acknowledges that it was Boyen but says it might well have been Hitler who said that "the spirit of a people must be awakened and nurtured by the government", that the army must be something more than a mere battle weapon, that it should be closely identified with the people itself, that the life of the individual belongs to the state, and that every inhabitant of the national territory is under obligation to share in its defense.

The story of Boyen's life is itself practically a history of the reorganization of the Prussian army. As a seventeen year old lieutenant this East Prussian *Junker,* son of an officer, was in Holland with the Duke of Brunswick. As captain of infantry he served in the Polish campaigns while others met defeat in the Rhineland. As a staff captain he was wounded and captured at Auerstedt, subsequently escaping and making his way to Memel for further staff service. There, and later as a member of the commission for the reorganization of the army, he was closely associated with Scharnhorst and Gneisenau and earned the respect of Stein and Hardenberg, to whom he owed his subsequent appointment, in 1814, as head of the war ministry. Meanwhile, in the war of liberation, he had served with distinction as chief of staff of an army corps.

It is for his work on the general staff and in the war ministry, however, rather than for his field service, that he is praised by his biographer. No credit is taken from Scharnhorst or Gneisenau; but it was actually their junior associate, Boyen, who drew up the mobilization plan under which troops were put into the field in 1813-14 and who subsequently completed and crowned their work by securing the king's approval on September 3, 1814, for Prussia's first law embodying the principle of universal military service, upon which, says his biographer, rests the state.

University of Wisconsin. CHESTER V. EASUM.

History of Political Thought in Germany from 1789 to 1815. By REINHOLD ARIS. With a Foreword by G. P. Gooch. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. 414. $4.25.)

THIS book presents an admirable exposition of the leading political thinkers in the classical and early romantic period of German literature, the "Augustan" age, as it has been called. It is a blessing in disguise that the intolerance of the Nazis has driven many a fine scholar to seek a refuge in the English-speaking countries and to devote himself to the interpretation abroad of German thought and German tradition. This volume shows ripe scholarship and a fine sense of proportion. The author has gathered with a skillful hand the outstanding strands of political thought from amongst a welter of available material.

The book is divided into three parts of which the first is concerned with Enlightenment and Revolution, more specifically with the impact of the French Revolution upon German thought. Here the discussion is focused upon Kant, the young Fichte, Humboldt, and Goethe. Dr. Aris believes that the French Revolution was a powerful force in molding the political speculation of these men, and there will be few inclined to contest this general idea. Problems of historical interpretation arise in connection with the more detailed aspects, and here occasional doubt must be admitted on the part of the reviewer. It seems that Dr. Aris is too ready to fall back upon the class concept in interpreting contradictory ideas expounded by the writers he examines. Valuable as the economic interpretation of history undoubtedly is, the notion of a bourgeois class is not sufficiently differentiated to account, for example, for subtle inconsistencies in Kantian metaphysics.

The second part is devoted to an analysis of the political thought of the romantic movement, more particularly of Möser, Herder, Novalis, Schlegel, and Görres. There is also an able chapter on the influence of Burke. Many English and American readers will feel that the ideas of these romantics are more typically German than those of Kant and other writers of the Enlightenment. The romantic attitude, plastically described by the author, has become more widely diffused in Germany than elsewhere and has remained a living force to this day. Indeed, it has experienced a bloody

resurrection in the Hitler movement—a development prophetically foreseen by Heinrich Heine in an extraordinary analysis of the political implications of German idealism.

The third part is appropriately given over to a study of the body of thought which revolved around the reconstruction of Prussia after the collapse in 1806. Here Fichte, the nationalist, Stein, the thwarted architect of a liberalized Prussia, and the lesser opponents of the rising centralized power of Prussia find their place. As may be expected from a German, Dr. Aris shows a keen appreciation of the role Prussia was destined to play in the building of the German national state. Indeed, there is an occasional touch of questionable pro-Prussian prejudice rather at variance with the author's general outlook. But on the whole there can be no quarrel with his central thesis that the ideas molded in conjunction with the reconstruction of Prussia were the most potent in regard to practical politics.

Taken as a whole, Dr. Aris's study fills a very real gap in the available literature. Provided with a well-selected bibliography and an adequate index, it should take its place at once as required reading for students in the history of political thought. The promised second volume on Hegel and the later romantics will, we hope, follow very soon.

Harvard University. CARL JOACHIM FRIEDRICH.

Das Werden des deutschen Staates seit dem Ausgang des Heiligen römischen Reiches, 1800 bis 1933: Eine verfassungsgeschichtliche Darstellung. Von HANS ERICH FEINE. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. 1936. Pp. xi, 487. 16 M.)

THIS is a work professing to trace and to interpret the dominant factors and trends in German national history in the period since the opening of the nineteenth century. After a sketchy survey of factors of significance for the growth of the idea of federation in Germany before 1815, the work deals quite extensively with the founding of the Germanic Confederation in 1815, the trend towards national consciousness between 1815 and 1848, the attempts of 1848 in national organization, and the conquest of unity in the Bismarckian era. It deals comprehensively with "the constitutional development of the German Empire" and covers with pronounced feeling the course of the "Intermediate Reich of Weimar" and the transition to the Third Reich of National Socialism. References are prefixed to each chapter as a whole and are given throughout for important statements in the text. It is admitted in the preface, however, that the work presents "no new scientific, authentically based knowledge" (p. v). Furthermore, in the preface and throughout the text of the book it is revealed that the author views the past uncompromisingly from the point of view of National Socialism. He states that he "has especially at heart the union with our brother-people in German-Austria" (p. vi) and indicates that he hopes for an extensive

reorganization of eastern Central Europe within one great federal community under German leadership (pp. 36, 40).

In general Feine emphasizes more the interpretation than the narration of developments. He maintains that the German Confederation, through its reactionary policy before 1848, forced the German national movement temporarily into a "radical, revolutionary channel" (p. 94). Holding to a strong line in defense of Prussian policies after 1848, he accuses Austria of having "inwardly renounced its German calling" (p. 206) and charges France with the pursuit of an aggressive policy of encirclement for the prevention of German unification (pp. 234-35). It was a "deep tragedy" for Bismarck, it is asserted, that he was not granted an opportunity to shape his work anew, "in the German sense", at the close of his career (p. 256). If it had not been for Bismarck's "monstrous" dismissal, he might, in the opinion of Feine, have engineered a stroke of state by withdrawing the right to vote from Social Democrats "and other declared enemies of the realm" (pp. 357-61). Feine writes very disparagingly of parliamentary development in Germany, particularly after 1890 (pp. 259, 309-10, 338, 341), and declares that the Social Democratic gains in the Reichstag election of 1912 "demonstrated the low state of politics" at that time (p. 377). "Without the World War", it is asserted, "German national exaltation, Hindenburg's presidency, above all the National Socialist movement and Adolf Hitler himself" would have been "quite unthinkable" (p. 395). As "we are after all placed in a period of violent historical events" (p. v), it is well, perhaps, to emphasize that our judgment of Feine's work is very likely to vary largely in accord with our feelings relative to the basic hypotheses, feelings, and point of view that he represents.

University of Illinois. F. S. Rodkey.

Ultra-Royalism and the French Restoration. By Nora E. Hudson. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xiii, 209. $3.75.)

Apart from its intrinsic merit, this book is valuable for several reasons. In the first place the Restoration is peculiarly interesting to students of French history, for not only does it contain the beginning of the parliamentary system and of the bourgeois liberal party that was long to dominate the country, but it was then that the crucial effort was made to reconcile the Old Regime with the new, to fuse what has been called the "Two Frances". Yet although much has, of course, been written on the Restoration, it has received, on the whole, less attention than certain other periods, such as the Revolution or the Second Empire. Much remains to be said, much material to be explored, and while the present volume does not bring many new facts to light, yet it fills a particular need, for the history of French Conservatism has been sadly neglected.

Most modern historians, imbued with the ideas of their own times, have tended unconsciously to stress in the Revolution and the Restoration those elements which were destined to triumph in the nineteenth century. Thus the growth of democracy has been studied with all the care due to the childhood of an heir apparent, while the evolution of the conservative forces has roused less interest. We have, for instance, histories of the liberal parties under the Restoration and the Second Empire but none of the royalist parties after 1848!

The Restoration, moreover, is a fertile field for those who are interested in the influence of political ideas. Most of the leaders of that time felt themselves obliged to be to some extent philosophers, as well as practical politicians, and at no time, not even during the Revolution, can the translation of ideologies into action be more clearly traced. Yet here, too, in studying them, historians have, as a rule, shown scant comprehension of the theories and aims of the men of the extreme right; they have been content to point out their grievous errors. Yet how can one understand the strange duality which has run through French political life right down to today without a genuine knowledge and understanding of the conflicting ideals?

But there are fashions even in history. Just as writers today, looking at the present state of Europe, tend to speak of Metternich with more respect than they did yesterday, so the amount of literature on such subjects as the counterrevolution and the war in the Vendée has grown during recent years. Among these books the present volume will hold an honorable place. It is written with detachment and scholarly thoroughness, and the "Ultras", studied with impartiality against a broad background, become if not more attractive, at least more comprehensible. The treatment, for instance, of Charles X, a person so difficult for historians to view objectively, is a model of critical amenity, and Chateaubriand, too, is analyzed with unusual penetration.

The writer has apparently found little unpublished material, though some does exist. A long footnote on page 180 refers, however, to an interesting unpublished dispatch in the Staatsarchiv in Vienna. She has made good use of memoirs, letters, and pamphlets, many of which are relatively little known.

There is an excellent account of the ideas and philosophy of the right in the first chapter, and the conclusion gives a powerful analysis of the problems and the forces at work in the period. The book is to be recommended to all who are interested in French history.

Barnard College. CHARLOTTE T. MURET.

Ultimi studi sul conte di Cavour. By FRANCESCO RUFFINI. [Biblioteca di cultura moderna.] (Bari: Gius. Laterza & figli. 1936. Pp. viii, 215. 14 l.)

ALTHOUGH this volume contains only fragments of an extensive work that the late Senator Ruffini intended to write on the religious experiences and thought of Cavour, it enriches our knowledge of the great statesman, to which Ruffini had made fundamental contributions in his *La giovinezza del conte di Cavour* (2 vols., 1912) and in his *Camillo di Cavour e Mélanie Waldor* (1914). From these two studies there had emerged a new and intimate picture of the youthful Cavour and the development of his ideas. Besides being a great Cavourian scholar, Ruffini was a distinguished canonist, a fearless champion of the Italian liberal tradition, even under fascism, and the author of *Religious Liberty* (Eng. tr., 1912), called by J. B. Bury an "illuminating contribution to the history of liberty".

The first chapter in the present volume, entitled "La devozione infantile del conte di Cavour" and partly based on unpublished material in the Cavourian archives at Santena, touches on Cavour's sensitivity as a child, the religious environment of his household, and early evidences of his independent spirit. The second chapter, "La crisi razionalistica", is an impressive study of some of the formative elements in Cavour's precocious intellectual growth. Ruffini brings out the full significance of Cavour's solid reading of Benjamin Constant, François Guizot, and Théodor Juffroy and their influence in orienting his mind towards a vigorous rationalism. The Piedmontese count had pondered the implications of religious issues long before he assumed political power. Ruffini's discussion will go a long way toward delivering many students from the traditional and stereotyped portrait of Cavour as a man who, from his earliest youth, was deeply concerned only with economic, political, and diplomatic questions. Revealing in this connection are the remarks made by Cavour at the age of twenty-five when he asked one of his Protestant cousins in Geneva to furnish him with literature on religious matters in Switzerland: "je suis curieux plus que de toute autre chose de ce qui tient à la marche des idées religieuses: c'est le grand mystère du siècle".

The last two chapters are reprints of studies which are not easily accessible: the learned and justly famous "Le origini elvetiche della formula del conte di Cavour: 'Libera chiesa in libero stato' "; and "L'opposizione al tempo di Cavour", an exhaustive analysis of Brofferio's and Guerrazzi's political and personal opposition to Cavour.

The Italian historian, Adolfo Omodeo, deserves congratulations for his careful selection and editing of the material in this volume. It is to be regretted, however, that there is no index, for the volume is studded with considered observations not only about various phases of Cavour's life but also about significant events and personages of the Risorgimento.

Harvard University. GAUDENS MEGARO.

Histoire du mouvement ouvrier. Par Édouard Dolléans. Préface de Lucien Febvre, professeur au Collège de France. Tome I, *1830-1871.* (Paris: Armand Colin. 1936. Pp. 397. 33 fr.)

This is a valuable and interesting study of the labor movement written primarily for students and other specialists in France. The author is always conscious of his nationality and emphasizes chiefly developments in his own country. Professor Dolléans clearly regards Proudhon as a nobler character and more profound thinker than Marx, and he feels that Babeuf was an important spiritual ancestor of Chartism in England. The reviewer wishes that these opinions of a distinguished and competent scholar were supported by evidence. It is regrettable also that there is no bibliography. There are numerous footnotes, but they are widely scattered, and some of the sources upon which the author has evidently drawn most freely are mentioned only in the text. It is clear that M. Dolléans is master of the literature of his subject produced by his countrymen and that he has consulted the national and some of the provincial archives on one or two important topics.

The text shows that the author is thoroughly familiar with the writings of Engels and Marx, and it indicates that he is well acquainted also with the writings of the Webbs. He wrote many years ago a book in two volumes on Chartism and another on Robert Owen. Yet it seems clear that these older studies were not brought up to date before being drawn upon for the present book. M. Dolléans makes no allusion to the works of Hovell and West on Chartism or to Graham Wallas's *Life of Francis Place.* Among recent American books on aspects of French economic history which Professor Dolléans covers in his book he does not seem to have heard of McKay's excellent study of the national workshops of 1848, Mason's book on the Commune, or the reviewer's *Anglo-French Treaty of Commerce of 1860 and the Progress of the Industrial Revolution in France.*

It is unfortunate that M. Dolléans has restricted his outlook to that of the laborer. He invariably presents the employers and the government as selfish and often as cruel, and he judges them solely on evidence drawn from their opponents or interpreted by them. His principal villain is Thiers, whom he condemns unreservedly on all occasions. While, undoubtedly, Thiers was a pigheaded *petit bourgeois* in his treatment of labor questions, he deserves some credit for his services to France as a patriot and statesman.

In dealing with the most important strikes and riots Professor Dolléans is, perhaps, at his best. He writes with the clarity and charm of the best French tradition. His portraits of French labor leaders are excellent and arouse the reader's sympathetic interest. But the first two introductory chapters seem to the reviewer the most valuable. M. Dolléans shows clearly the change in the position of the worker, first, with the introduction of machinery, and second, with the development of the corporation. He makes the reader feel keenly the worker's sense of helplessness and degradation

under these new and impersonal forms of tyranny. He shows what the recurrent economic crises of the nineteenth century meant to the laborer who felt himself deprived of all security in his employment. On all these points Professor Dolléans is very clear indeed. One wishes that he could have given also some attention to the more recent literature on the industrial revolution and treated it as a slow process of evolution.

University of Michigan. A. L. DUNHAM.

English Radicalism, 1832-1852. By S. MACCOBY. (London: George Allen and Unwin; Chicago: University Press. 1935. Pp. 462. $5.00.)

DR. Maccoby has set himself the task of correcting the error "of viewing the rapid political and legislative changes of the 1830's and 1840's not primarily from the standpoint of the forces compelling their adoption, but rather from that of the legal machinery registering them, and registering them in very resistive fashion" (p. 7). Or more simply stated, he has studied the pressure of the voting middle classes and the voteless working classes on the British government.

The author has done a prodigious amount of research. He has consulted the works of other scholars and of foreign observers, manuscripts, newspapers, official documents, and sermons. He has studied numerous agitations of this period in the country and has written the fate of each in parliament and often its handling by the executive officials of the government, national and local, as well.

His materials have almost overwhelmed him, and he has tried to condense into one volume what should, perhaps, appear in several. Indeed, much that is covered is already adequately treated elsewhere and might have been omitted entirely or merely referred to. The chapter on radicals and the empire is a case in point. Moreover, the importance of radicalism, for example that of the workers, is overemphasized in such problems as the emancipation of the slaves. In this instance Anglican and other Evangelical religious fervor, not radicalism of any kind, played the dominant part, as the testimonies of Wilberforce, Clarkson, James Stephen, Sir James Stephen, and Zachary Macaulay amply prove.

Besides, the philosophical radicals, mainly followers of Bentham, were often in violent disagreement with the workers, and the workers in turn were usually divided into conservatives and extremists. One particular reform movement can be adequately traced from birth to success or defeat and the agreements and disagreements of the reformers stated. For instance, as is well known, Chadwick, Hume, Grote, and Place were in favor of the new Poor Law; Cobbett, Attwood, and Chartists like O'Connor, the Reverend J. R. Stephens, and Richard Oastler were opposed to it. However, the complexities of many such reforms briefly treated in rapid succession bewilder the reader.

The long discussions of the Chartist movement and its parliamentary defeat give the impression that but little was accomplished, whereas during these twenty years public education was begun; the great public health work of Edwin Chadwick was inaugurated; the Poor Law was reconstituted; slavery was abolished; church abuses were largely removed; the ten hours bill became law; army, navy, and prison discipline were lightened; the stage was set for the abolition of penal transportation; and the corn laws were repealed.

The reviewer, however, wishes to praise the book and commend it to students of the period as a mine of information. Any scholar will get dozens of new slants for his own specialized study from the sources referred to in the text and bibliography. There are side lights on penal transportation; on Malthusian doctrine and emigration; on the influence of Robert Owen; on cabinet ministers and obscure men; on foreign affairs; on radical newspapers and periodicals; on church and state. In fact, as the author indicates, anti-clerical and disestablishment feeling ran high at times, and this sentiment, in part, accounts for the Oxford movement.

Unfortunately, there are intricacies of style which make the book very difficult to read. A more adequate and detailed index of the footnotes, as well as of the text, would have been invaluable for scholars. Much pertinent information is found in the very extensive notes.

University of California at Los Angeles. FRANK J. KLINGBERG.

Quellen zur deutschen Politik Österreichs, 1859-1866. Unter Mitwirkung von Oskar Schmid, herausgegeben von HEINRICH RITTER VON SRBIK. Band IV, *März 1864 bis August 1865.* [Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. Jahrhunderts.] (Oldenburg i. O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1937. Pp. xxiii, 834. 52 M.)

AUSTRIA'S policy toward the Prussia of Bismarck and toward the lesser German states led by Beust and Pfordten, from the high tide of the Danish war in March, 1864, to the convention of Gastein in August, 1865,—this is the theme of Professor Srbik's fourth volume of documents. The Austrians were confronted with a problem not unfamiliar to the present generation. What policy should they adopt toward a restless, ambitious, unsatisfied power under a fearless minister with far-reaching objectives, who scorned the slow procedure of the German Confederation and practiced a policy of surprises, of swift reprisals, of bilateral agreements outside the *Bund?* Francis Joseph and Rechberg decided to meet the Prussians more than halfway, at Schönbrunn in August, 1864; but their offers were insufficient to induce King William to give up the "free hand". Faced with the prospect that the more they offered the more Prussia would demand, Francis Joseph and Mensdorff-Biegeleben turned to the opposite policy. They reminded Prussia of her obligations under the "Covenant" and welcomed the pressure

of the smaller states against the "aggressor". This was but grist to Bismarck's mill, and when he forced the issue in July, 1865, Austria's economic weakness and disarmed condition compelled the Habsburg to accept a compromise favorable to the Hohenzollern, though King William again, as at Schönbrunn, clipped the wings of Bismarck's high-flying plans.

The key documents have all been published before, but there is new material for small special studies on the diplomacy of the *Mittelstaaten*. Private documents give evidence of a greater fear of the liberal movement on the part of Francis Joseph's advisers than has heretofore been realized. Bismarck in a sparkling interview counseled the Austrians to dismiss Schmerling and send his constitution to the devil. The text of the unconcluded Schönbrunn "agreement" in Biegeleben's handwriting disproves Rechberg's well-known story that Biegeleben refused to draft it and omits, but does not exclude, the expedient of partitioning Schleswig-Holstein. Karolyi's and Chotek's interesting dispatches from Berlin are not conclusive for Bismarck's real aims, for Karolyi at least had not penetrated the subtleties of the minister-president's diplomacy; nevertheless, they must be taken into account in solving the riddle of what Bismarck wanted from the crisis of 1865, and why he accepted a compromise.

Five documents are incorrectly dated: No. 1804 should be dated between July 26 and August 1, 1864 (not September); No. 2112, on June 24, 1865 (not "before June 24"); No. 2125, Laxenburg, July 9 (not Vienna, July 10); No. 2152, Biegeleben's unfinished draft of the Gastein convention, should follow No. 2153 (Blome's terms) and cannot be dated before August 5 or 6; by the misdating of No. 2128, as of July 10, 1865, an important link in the Austro-Prussian negotiations concerning Schleswig-Holstein is misplaced by two months, since this is Biegeleben's memorandum of May 6, by which Austria offered to break the deadlock existing since March.

On the whole, a high standard of mechanical accuracy is maintained.

Cambridge, Massachusetts. CHESTER W. CLARK.

The Paris Commune of 1871. By FRANK JELLINEK. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. 447. $3.00.)

THE Commune of 1871 is a historical episode which is neither well known nor frequently interpreted by historians outside of France. An important exception is that group strongly influenced by Marx and Marxian socialism. Marx's *Civil War in France* tore the Commune from the closely woven web of French historical development and made it an important stage in a supra-national class struggle. So dominant has been Marx's influence that subsequent—at least recent—historical writing has had to take the Marxian thesis as a starting point.

Was the Commune an episode in French history to be explained in the

main by antecedent events peculiar to France—dominated by a characteristically Jacobin ideology indigenous to the French revolutionary tradition, shaped by the events of the Franco-Prussian war and the siege of Paris, made possible by the arming of the National Guard, and touched off by a humiliating peace? Or is it to be understood, on the other hand, in terms of the development of international capitalism, of the growth of a wage-earning proletariat increasingly indoctrinated with a socialist ideology and conscious of class antagonism? One is not forced, of course, to choose in its nakedness either one or the other of these hypotheses. Those who emphasize the first point of view most strongly would have difficulty in denying that the Commune was subject to socialist influences. On the other hand, those who treat it as an episode in the class struggle find it impossible to separate the Commune from its French context. It is a matter of emphasis, but the use of the relevant data is profoundly influenced by where the emphasis is placed.

Mr. Jellinek accepts in general the Marxian interpretation, but instead of examining in detail the economic structure of France and, in particular, of Paris, instead of a close consideration of the pertinent questions of class stratification and of the evidences of class struggle versus class collaboration, he relies for his explanation of the revolution and the events of the Commune in the main on the same sort of political, military, and ideological factors peculiar to the France of 1870 as do those who espouse the alternative interpretation. The result is that his semi-Marxian interpretation of the Commune is not woven into the structure of his book but gives rather the appearance of being tacked on in the concluding two chapters.

This does not prevent the book from being—indeed it permits it to be—a lively, colorful, and well-written account of the Commune. Although his work is undocumented, Mr. Jellinek has obviously examined a large part of the original and secondary material and has enjoyed access to some hitherto unavailable papers. The period of the Commune was extraordinarily productive of interesting and frequently fantastic personalities, and the author makes them come to life with their natural intonation and coloring. This is not to say that the book is unduly anecdotal; on the contrary, it is a serious work which succeeds in remaining eminently readable.

Harvard University. EDWARD S. MASON.

The Two Mr. Gladstones. By G. T. GARRATT. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. xv, 311. $3.00.)

THE hypothesis advanced by the author of this book is too simple. "Oxford on the surface but Liverpool beneath" is an easy and simple generalization to apply to Gladstone, and it is not without truth; but any attempt to crystallize that casual and contemporary remark into a key to

Gladstone's character and to explain his career in terms of a dual personality, sometimes Oxford, sometimes Liverpool, is, it seems to me, contradicted by the facts. Almost every human being is, in a certain sense, "Mr. Liverpool" or "Mr. Oxford", and so was Gladstone. This, however, did not mean that he had a dual personality, and to portray this subtle and complex person as a kind of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of politics is unwarrantedly fanciful.

"It was, of course, Mr. Liverpool who married, was an admirable husband, had a large and affectionate family." But why Mr. Liverpool rather than Mr. Oxford? Since when have the cultured scholars and philosophic gentlemen of Oxford regarded marriage and happiness as something reserved for the bourgeoisie? Or for that matter, why should the religious life be considered as so wholly within the Oxford bailiwick?

Let us ponder on this strange sentence: "If Mr. Oxford was the moving spirit in Gladstone's Irish policy, it was usually Mr. Liverpool who presided over the cabinet and held the balance between the progressive members and the Whigs." This would seem to imply one kind of man in regard to Ireland and a different person in regard to the cabinet. But this is not the historic Gladstone. In his Irish policy and in his cabinet he was the same Gladstone, imperious yet cautious, slow, incredibly slow, in coming to a decision, obstinate to a degree, yet cautious, ever leaving loopholes for potential retreats and occasionally using them.

Many of Gladstone's more pronounced characteristics do not fit into either of his two prescribed roles. For instance, he was a great actor, "the greatest actor I have ever seen", said Parnell, a good judge. But actors are to be found in Liverpool as well as in Oxford. Many a man of business has saved himself from bankruptcy by superb acting; many an Oxford don has been totally deficient in a sense of the dramatic. Gladstone never lacked it; he had it when he delivered a budget speech; he had it when he pleaded for Irish home rule. It was not something which came and went; he was no chameleon.

Gladstone likewise was pugnacious and grew constantly more so. He loved a fight, a characteristic belonging exclusively neither to the atmosphere of the university nor to that of the countinghouse. A large part of Gladstone's political career was spent in personal controversy. He fought tooth and nail with Palmerston in the latter's own cabinet; his duel with Disraeli was protracted and also personal; so also were his controversies with Parnell and Chamberlain. It was neither Mr. Liverpool nor Mr. Oxford, primarily, who was thus concerned, but just Mr. Gladstone.

Generalizations about his career are easy to make, difficult to sustain. He was an enigmatic person and, perhaps, as in the case of Woodrow Wilson, no single generalization can stand truthfully without qualification. Hotheaded yet patient, explosive yet suave, proud yet humble, idealistic

yet practical, he wrote laboriously, spoke magnificently, and has faded like a passing comet. He defies definition. Instead of there being two Mr. Gladstones there are a hundred.

Princeton University. WALTER P. HALL.

The Dreyfus Case by the Man Alfred Dreyfus and his Son Pierre Dreyfus. Translated and edited by DONALD C. MCKAY, Department of History, Harvard University. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1937. Pp. xxiv, 303. $3.75.)

IN 1901 appeared a portion of Alfred Dreyfus's autobiography covering the five years from the original court-martial of 1894, through the prison period on Devil's Island, to the Rennes court-martial of 1899. Now an additional portion is presented for the years from 1899 to 1906, when the Court of Cassation finally reversed the military judgments and fully acquitted Dreyfus. This portion, edited and apparently much excised by Dreyfus's son Pierre, consists of only a hundred pages and contributes relatively little to our knowledge of the facts in the *cause célèbre*. Yet it should not be neglected by students of French history or of psychology. It sheds light on several details of the protracted and complicated maneuverings of the Dreyfusards for a reversal of the Rennes judgment and more brightly on Dreyfus's own psychology. Indeed, it is indispensable for an understanding of Dreyfus himself, of a narrow, military, and legalistic mind which quite overlooked the big social and political factors in the situation and, under the stress of unjust accusation and condemnation, became veritably obsessed with the "plotting" of generals and with the vindicating of his own personal and family "honor". It is a mind pertinacious and mathematical but neither expansive nor inspiriting.

The autobiographical chapters are followed by a brief sketch of the elder Dreyfus's career until his death in 1935 and are preceded by the younger Dreyfus's 132-page summary of the "Affair". This is written with some literary charm and with pardonable filial piety and bias. What is less pardonable is its regrettable lack of clarity and proportion and its factual lapses. It ignores five of the eight documents in the crucial secret dossier of the first court-martial. It fails to utilize pertinent information now available in *Die grosse Politik* implicating certain French statesmen in the Affair. It naïvely describes Bunau-Varilla as a friend of Dreyfus.

Throughout Pierre's summary, as well as throughout Alfred's autobiography, and in fact throughout all Dreyfusard literature, recurs the charge that the Affair was a conscious "plot", a deliberate "conspiracy", on the part of anti-Semitic forces entrenched in the army, the church, and (to a large extent) the state. To the present reviewer such a charge is as preposterous and pernicious as the countercharge, emanating from professional anti-Semites like Drumont and Stöcker (and Hitler), that most ills of

modern society are attributable to Jewish plots and conspiracies. "Conspiracy" is always a facile and popular explanation of human faults and insufficiencies, for it is one that can be exploited and accepted in partisan interests with a minimum of thought and historical knowledge. And it is so simple. Of this the Dreyfus Affair is an outstanding example. It could not have been the most famous—and notorious—case it was in modern French history had not one group of Frenchmen come to believe in a "revolutionary" Jewish conspiracy, and another group, in a "reactionary" Catholic-Royalist conspiracy. Yet there is little evidence of any such "conspiracy" on either side. The Affair began as an all too human instance of mistaken identity; and however dishonest the mistake may have been on the part of a few junior officers, such as the rascally Esterhazy, the ambitious Henry, or the theatrical Paty du Clam, it was surely an honest mistake on the part of their superiors. Even Pierre Dreyfus acknowledges, in unguarded moments, that General Mercier, whom Alfred Dreyfus accuses of having been "the principal author of the crime of 1894" (p. 146), was merely "impulsive and headstrong", "very much under the influence of his staff", and "all unsuspecting" (pp. 18, 20). The evidence against Dreyfus ***seemed*** conclusive, so conclusive indeed that not only the highest officials in army and state were completely duped by it but many of them continued to be duped after there was reasonable basis for grave doubt. Subsequently, when partisan feelings had been aroused to fever pitch and a battle line drawn between Dreyfusards and anti-Dreyfusards, emotional attachment to a "cause" made it well-nigh impossible to perceive in the opposing camp any honesty or truth. Because truth turned out to be on the side of the Dreyfusards, it does not follow that all anti-Dreyfusards, or any large fraction of them, were dishonest, much less that they were in a "plot".

Nor is it anything but loose partisan phrasemaking to identify anti-Semitism and the anti-Dreyfusard agitation with a "formidable clerical-royalist movement", as the Dreyfusards have been wont to do and as the American editor of the present work thoughtlessly repeats (p. 10). Careful study of the French "clerical-royalist movement" of the 1890's would disclose that it was not at all "formidable"—except in the imagination of Jaurès, Clemenceau, and certain other Jacobin politicians. Déroulède and Barrès were leading anti-Semites and anti-Dreyfusards, and they were neither royalists nor practicing Catholics. On the other hand, Maître Demange, the attorney for Dreyfus in the court-martial of 1894 and again in that of 1899, was, in Pierre Dreyfus's own words, "a fervent Catholic and a warm admirer of the army" (p. 22).

Mr. Donald McKay has done a good job of translating and, as editor, has added some useful footnotes and appendixes, a chronology, biographical sketches of the *dramatis personae*, and an exhaustive index. Thanks to him, the American edition is distinctly superior to the original French edition

and also to the edition brought out in England with a translation by Dr. Betty Morgan. Incidentally it furnishes a nice supplement to Colonel Schwartzkoppen's memoirs, *The Truth about Dreyfus,* which appeared posthumously in 1930 and which established Dreyfus's innocence beyond the peradventure of a doubt. There remains the need for a substantial, sober, and really scholarly work on the whole Dreyfus Affair.

Columbia University. CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

La crise bosniaque, 1908-1909, et les puissances européennes. Par MOMTCHILO NINTCHITCH, ancien ministre des Affaires étrangères de Yougoslavie. Deux tomes. (Paris: Alfred Costes. 1937. Pp. 418; 412. 120 fr.)

THESE excellent volumes are far more than an analysis of the annexation crisis. They constitute, rather, a diplomatic history of Bosnia-Herzegovina since Austria occupied the provinces in 1878. Concluding chapters touch on the period 1909-14, but the author has definitely avoided making this a book on war responsibility. Mr. Nintchitch was foreign minister of Jugoslavia during 1921-26 and in the face of much internal opposition firmly followed a policy of *rapprochement* with Italy. He also served as president of the Seventh Assembly of the League of Nations. His experience as a statesman leads him to make much of the personal factor in diplomacy. Although writing as a Serbian he has a much broader outlook, and his volumes are not narrowly nationalistic. One could search far to find a better appreciation of Archduke Francis Ferdinand's opposition to a war with Serbia than is here presented in a section of the second volume. The usual document collections, memoirs, and studies, including a number in Slavic languages, are used. In addition, for the period 1908-9, the author has had access to the Serbian archives. Approximately twenty-eight citations are made from these, and since the footnotes are all placed at the end of the volumes these "new documents" can be easily spotted. They do not materially change the picture; the most significant contribution is the content of the Serbian-Montenegrin treaty of 1908, which is entirely at variance with the text which was at that time surreptitiously furnished to the Vienna foreign office (see *Österreich-Ungarns Aussenpolitik,* nos. 541, 599).

The year 1906 was fateful, for it brought Aehrenthal to power in Austria and Isvolsky in Russia. Both of them favored an active foreign policy. Unwilling and unable to undertake steps toward internal reform, Aehrenthal desired to raise the prestige of the monarchy through some stroke of foreign policy. His Sanjak railway project broke the "entente" of 1897 and 1903 with Russia over Balkan policy. Already resolved in principle on the necessity of annexing Bosnia-Herzegovina, Aehrenthal willingly entered upon negotiations with Russia when Isvolsky opened up the topic by his *aide-mémoire* of July, 1908. At Buchlau, the author holds, Isvolsky was duped by his Austrian host, who had the great ability of making a statement and

at the same time concealing its meaning. The Russian statesman, who spoke only his personal opinion and never officially for the Russian government, left the conference uncertain as to (1) the date when the annexation was to be proclaimed and (2) how he was to obtain his desired settlement of the Straits question. Isvolsky told Milovanović, the Serbian prime minister, who was taking the cure in Bohemia, of the forthcoming annexation and advised him to demand compensations. Milovanović had the impression that it would take place about the first of December, 1908.

The tortuous process of negotiation subsequent to the Buchlau meeting is described in great detail. The author maintains that Isvolsky had no reason to expect the annexation to come as soon as it did, and Aehrenthal is pilloried for his precipitate action, which was undoubtedly planned to fit in with Bulgaria's declaration of independence. He denies that Isvolsky's hostility and ill-will toward Aehrenthal date only from the receipt in Paris of instructions from St. Petersburg. Isvolsky had expressed this dislike before he received these messages, and now, as before, he insisted on the international character of the annexation and the necessity of a European conference to settle the question. The final "yes or no" note from Berlin to St. Petersburg, demanding recognition of the annexation, is condemned as uncalled for. It gave Germany a cheap diplomatic victory at the expense of Russian hostility and the strengthening of the bonds of the entente. Isvolsky was seized with a case of nervous jitters at this time and capitulated too easily on all fronts.

Much is made of Aehrenthal's statement in August, 1908, that in case of the collapse of Turkey the goal of Austrian diplomacy would be the division of Serbia between Bulgaria and Austria ("Le projet de démembrement de la Serbie", I, 183-94, and *passim*). Since such dismemberment could come only through war, the conclusion is that Aehrenthal's policy in the fall of 1908 was directed toward a war with Serbia. In January, 1909, Aehrenthal is considered to have come to oppose a Serbian war largely as a result of a telegram sent by the czar to Francis Joseph. However, in the same memoir from which Nintchitch quotes, Aehrenthal also speaks of the necessity of negotiating railway concessions with the "new lords of the Sanjak—Serbia and Montenegro" when Turkey in Europe collapses. This would seem to indicate that in 1908 no dismemberment of Serbia through war was planned, at least for the near future.

The Austrian—or better, Hungarian—officials are naturally criticized for their failure to undertake internal reforms on behalf of the Slavs. This was a fundamental error which could never be erased through foreign policy. Austria's abandonment of the Sanjak is considered unwise as it did not produce the desired results. Instead of ending the fear of the "Drang nach Salonika" this heightened the tension, for the Serbians now believed that the expansion would go via Belgrade. Serbian policy during

the crisis was not consistent in its various demands for no recognition of the annexation, autonomy of various kinds, compensations, etc. However, the Serbian leaders, through their agitation, had been able to make their Serbian problem into a European one, which was exactly what they aimed to do. It is to be regretted that Mr. Nintchitch does not tell us more about the Serbian resurgence at this time. A treatment of Serbian patriotic societies in the same spirit of scholarship as is shown throughout the volumes would have been most welcome.

An annex of eighty pages surveys German Balkan policy. Here Bismarck's wise and carefully restricted commitments are contrasted with those of Bülow in the later period. The latter's firm and uncritical support of Austrian Balkan policy is roundly condemned as detrimental both to German interests and international peace. It is held that such support as Bülow gave was entirely unnecessary in order to preserve the alliance and only encouraged Austria to undertake new Balkan adventures.

Unfortunately, pages 144-61 of Volume II of the reviewer's copy were missing and pages 124-44 duplicated.

Bowdoin College. E. C. Helmreich.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Landnahme und Kolonisation in Canada am Beispiel Südontarios. Von Carl Schott. [Schriften des Geographischen Instituts.] (Kiel: Universität Kiel. 1936. Pp. xv, 330.)

The present volume is a study of the transition of Canada from an unbroken wilderness to a modern agricultural and industrial society by means of an intensive study concentrated upon the region in southern Ontario located roughly between Lake Huron and the Ottawa River. In some respects the book suggests the studies of group settlements by American and Canadian social scientists in the Canadian Pioneer Belt series. The approach to the problem is essentially that of tne geographer who holds that geographic conditions, not man's designs on the trestle board of life, have been decisive in shaping the history of peoples. It is apparent from studies like these that the border line between the new geography and the new history is rapidly disappearing.

After a thorough discussion of factors of geology, climate, and vegetation, the author proceeds to the coming of man into the Canadian wilderness, the characteristics of the Indian economy, and the contributions of French Canadians, American Loyalists, immigrants from the British Isles and Europe, German Loyalists, Hessians and Mennonites from Pennsylvania and New York, and the Negro migration of ante-bellum days. There follow sections on the origin of place names, the survey and disposal of the public domain, including the Loyalist grants, Governor Simcoe's plans

for the settlement of Upper Canada, the military grants following the War of 1812, the crown and clergy reserves, the problem of the squatters, and the history of land speculation, private as well as by groups like Galt's Canada Company. Dr. Schott follows the life of frontier days through its successive stages and describes the wasteful methods of the masterful pioneers. He includes sections on the lumber trade, the development of transportation from rivers and roads to railways, the progress of housing from blockhouse to Georgian style, the rise of towns, and the development of modern farming and industry. To Americans this is a familiar story.

Although there are a few minor slips, the work has been thoroughly done. Most of the material was gathered on the ground in Canada in 1932 and 1933. The volume contains many excellent charts and photographs and a remarkably complete and useful bibliography. The emphasis throughout is on geographic factors, and the general history of the section has been treated only in very sketchy fashion. To the European student the volume will no doubt be of great interest and value. For the American and Canadian scholar it is essentially an elaboration and refinement of the familiar frontier thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner, whose name, incidentally, does not appear in the book.

Oberlin College. CARL WITTKE.

The West in American History. By DAN ELBERT CLARK. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1937. Pp. xi, 682. $3.50.)

THIS is the most complete volume in textbook form yet offered on the American West. It begins with the explorations and settlements of the early Spanish conquistadors and moves steadily forward across the continent and the years to the farthest West and the passing of the last frontier. The impression of completeness is so great that one is inclined ungratefully to ask why the expansion of Europe, which began the American story, and the lingering social-intellectual Western manifestations in rural belts since 1890 are not also included. If that had been done, it might be asserted with much truth that Professor Clark had come nearer the Turner conception, as presented in his classes, than any other writer.

The book is primarily descriptive in character. It is divided into three parts: "The West under Spain, France, and England"; "The Frontier of the Middle West"; and "The Frontier of the Far West". These titles suggest the general treatment, and the space given to each—167 pages to the first, 236 to the second, and 222 to the third—indicates the balance. A brief but adequate description of the physical stage and its Indian occupants precedes the story of exploration, settlement, and conflict for control between the European rivals. One might expect from such a beginning that the first American colonies might be viewed as frontiers in themselves, but not so. The point of interest, instead, quickly shifts to the outer edge of settlement, and the story

turns about expansion rather than social-economic evolution. The treatment generally is episodical, and there is little effort made to illuminate the social process which caused Turner to speak of the United States as "a huge page in the history of society". That is less true of the last two sections, where forms—political, economic, and social—can be seen rising out of the raw wilderness. But even here the abundance of details on exploration, types of national exploitation, and means of transportation seems quite to hide the more universal story of peoples in motion toward new lands, settlers wringing a surplus from nature's resources and finding markets and ways to them for the more rapid lifting of life to the patterns already well advanced in the older regions. The interplay of sections, which was primarily the product of the expansion movement, is only briefly touched upon. Cultural beginnings, while handled in excellent fashion, are relegated to a separate chapter, where they appear a bit disjointed from the main story. All of which indicates that the work is primarily factual rather than interpretive.

Professor Clark gives a much needed redefinition of the frontier which frees it from the narrow census designation of two persons to the square mile and widens its scope to the entire region where "the wilderness" is being turned into "a settled country". The "frontier line" idea has always been confusing.

The student of Southern history will be sharply disappointed with Professor Clark's handling of the Southwest in the middle period. Someday it will be understood that the expansion of the plantation system, slavery, and all things Southern into a wilderness is just as much a Western story, with its own unique results on men and institutions, as is that of farms and free laborers to the Northwest. The struggle of the West for markets in the War of 1812 is another feature which is not quite understood. Western men frankly declared that their grievances arose from inadequate markets and openly charged the defect to British control of the seas. We have too long sought hidden causes of a very obvious attitude.

But these are minor defects in a splendid book—the best text yet offered in the field. It is more complete, it is better written, and its general approach is more satisfactory than any previous treatment given to the West. It deserves wide use in college classes.

The University of Chicago. AVERY CRAVEN.

American Political and Social History. By HAROLD UNDERWOOD FAULKNER, Smith College. [Crofts American History Series, Dixon Ryan Fox, general editor.] (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. 1937. Pp. xxii, 771. $3.75.)

A History of the South, 1607-1936. By WILLIAM B. HESSELTINE, Associate Professor of History, University of Wisconsin. [Prentice-Hall History Series, Carl Wittke, editor.] (New York: Prentice-Hall. 1936. Pp. xiii, 748. $3.75.)

The Federal Union: A History of the United States to 1865. By JOHN D. HICKS, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1937. Pp. xvii, 733. $3.50.)

ALL three of these works are fine examples of modern textbook writing. Probably Hesseltine's is the most timely, that of Hicks the most original, and Faulkner's the most interesting.

The last-named, covering the subject from the fifteenth century to the twentieth, is necessarily a rapid summary, but the condensation has been done with judgment and scholarship. The entire colonial period is covered in less than 100 pages. The second division, "The Emergence of a New Nation", 1775-1809, is given but 70 pages, while the period 1809-1869, "Nationalism and Sectionalism", receives 223 pages. "The Industrial Age", ending in 1896, is allotted 115 pages, while the rest of the book, "World Power", occupies 204. From this it will appear that nearly half of the book is devoted to the period since the Civil War—which is just as it should be. Each chapter is followed by a brief bibliography, while at the end of the book there is a full, well-selected bibliography, arranged by chapters. There are five small but clear colored maps and eighteen black and white, usually quite satisfactory. The illustrations are contemporary and well chosen. While in every chapter some attention is given to economic and social features, seven of the forty chapters are devoted to such matters as "Colonial Life", "The Agrarian Revolt", "Life in the Post-War Decade", etc. As with Faulkner's other books, the style of this is attractive—remarkably so, considering the condensation.

Hesseltine's work is the most conventional of the three. It is frankly chronological in arrangement and reveals the least use of original sources. There is, however, greater need for such a text than for either of the others. While the treatment is mainly that of the familiar political history of the South, with due attention to national ramifications, there are frequent passages of economic and social interest, as well as entire chapters on such subjects as "Life in the Tobacco Colonies" and "Society in the New South". The narrative is necessarily rather sketchy but is clear and generally interesting. Each chapter has a well-selected and adequate bibliography. The most notable omission is Coulter's *History of Georgia.* Ten of the twenty-seven chapters are devoted to the period from the Revolution to the Civil War and five to the latter struggle—that is, nearly three fifths of the book, while the colonial-revolutionary epoch gets about one fifth and the period since 1865 about the same. From this it appears that the emphasis is upon that era during which what may be called "the Southernness" of the section's history was most apparent. While there are occasional passages at which a "Bourbon" Southerner might cavil, the book is fair and just. By collecting and segregating the Southern items in the national history, it supplies a longfelt need. The outstanding defect is the entire absence of maps and other illustrations. In institutions where no separate course in Southern history is offered this book will be a useful reference.

In the matter of maps and illustrations Hicks's book is a direct contrast. Where Hesseltine has neither map nor picture to illustrate three centuries of Southern history and over 700 pages, Faulkner has twenty-three maps and seventeen pictures for about the same period and 705 pages. Hicks has eleven colored and twenty-three black and white maps and forty-seven pictures to illustrate 687 pages covering nearly three quarters of a century less than the other two. The maps are clear, and the illustrations, whether contemporary portraits or cartoons, are well chosen. As always with Hicks, the style is clear and interesting. About one fifth of the book is devoted to the colonial era, one tenth to the revolutionary-constitutional epoch, one eighth to the Civil War, and the rest, over half, to the period 1789-1860. While the narrative is mainly chronological-political, due attention is given to social and economic factors. The footnotes are few and mainly bibliographical, and a complete alphabetical bibliography is given at the end of the book. In the pages dealing with the colonial era no mention is made of the settlements of the Swedes, Palatines, and Welsh, and Salem witchcraft is relegated to a footnote. The conclusion of the work is that the Civil War made industrialism possible, almost inevitable.

All three of these books should have a wide use as college texts, as well as being valuable handbooks for the general reader.

Hamilton College. MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR.

Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island, 1716-1752. Edited by DOROTHY S. TOWLE. With an Introduction by CHARLES M. ANDREWS. [American Legal Records, Volume III, The Littleton-Griswold Fund.] (Washington: American Historical Association. 1936. Pp. 595. $7.50.)

THIS is a volume which should interest the social or economic historian. For here, in the materials selected and reprinted from the records of the Rhode Island vice-admiralty court, the student of colonial commerce may unearth the expected wealth of detail as to the type of cargoes carried—the number of Negro slaves and the hogsheads of sugar, the quantities of rum and molasses—and as to the hazards Rhode Island trade underwent, whether from the activity of privateers, leaking ships, or the dangers of ice and snow.

From the point of view of legal history, however, this volume leaves much to be desired. No one appreciates more than the reviewer the need of competent work in colonial legal history, particularly as lawyers themselves have done little to advance scientific work in this field. Early in post-Revolutionary judicial history the courts evolved the fiction, still cherished, that their competence on points of law embraced a judicial knowledge of its history, thus opening the door to an a priori method of historiography which has made the publication of records a matter of little or no consequence to the bar at large. The practical effect of this was to cast into the fumbling hands of laymen the complicated task of reconstructing the story of our law's growth from 1607 to 1783. Whether or not this reconstruction may approxi-

mate the truth is of little practical moment to the legal profession; the fictions of the courts regarding colonial law, invalid though they be as history, serve as a sort of insulation against the absorption of inept or inaccurate statements from without. If a lay writer wishes to believe that on a given point—let us say the effect of an assignment of a chose in action—the law of New York province is sufficiently stated if reference is made to a South Carolina case of 1690 or a Pennsylvania case of 1718, the practicing lawyer or judge, entrenched in his fictions, will be the last to protest, since what laymen wish to believe about the law is their own affair. This immunity from professional attack has apparently served to lull the lay historian into a false sense of his capacity to write legal history for a period when the technical complexities of English law had reached their apogee. A solemn perusal of Tidd's *Practice of the King's Bench* should demonstrate once and for all the true perils of the task.

What has thus far been said is an essential preliminary to an estimate of the value of publishing colonial legal records in general and of the present publication in particular. If our colonial records have any value at all for legal historical purposes, it is in the field of procedure, and the practice of the courts can be reconstructed only after a scrutiny of all the available records. Only thus can the norm be found and the aberration identified. In the field of political or social history the ends of science may be served by an occasional citation of a manuscript source. But it is not so in the law, least of all in procedure, where form must be known to the last available detail before one can proceed to the study of function and thence to the perplexing relations with substance.

We are led, moreover, to ask why, if a selection is to be made, the task is committed to one who is admittedly "unlearned in the technical language of maritime law" (p. 98); and more pertinently, how can procedure be illuminated by one who regards a libel as a "form document" (p. 98) and feels her duty as a historian of procedure discharged by reproducing evidence and decree, consistently denying the reader the consolation of tracing the movement of the particular cases through the court minutes. Despite the compiler's claim that her materials are selected so as to give a view of "court procedure", it is obvious that her heart is set primarily not upon such a reconstruction but, via the reprint of endless "depositions", upon a picture of the vicissitudes of colonial commerce. The failure to include the minutes as a fundamental guide to the procedure is the more provoking because neither in the compiler's introduction nor in what she has seen fit to select can one gain insight into such prosy matters as process, security, stipulations, and, in particular, contumacy, for which the English admiralty courts had evolved elaborate rules. The absence of adequate materials on these phases of procedure leaves the inquiring scholar with no means of determining whether or not there existed in the Rhode Island admiralty procedure anything like

the close correspondence with contemporary ecclesiastical procedure that prevailed in the English admiralty court. This is a basic problem when dealing with the American reception of non-common-law jurisprudence. It does not occur to the compiler, because she believes that the "artificial practices of the eighteenth century admiralty in England came about as a result of the separation of the admiralty practitioners, living more or less isolated in chambers at Doctors' Commons, from any contact with the common law"!

The impression which the compiler's introduction and her selected materials leave upon the lawyer historian is not dissipated by an examination of the extensive general introduction, which comes from the pen of one who is, certainly since Osgood's death, the dean of colonial historians. This introduction, which contains many hitherto unpublished details, attempts a survey in general of the vice-admiralty courts in America. But even a cursory perusal will convince the lawyer historian that the time is not yet ripe to attack this task and, further, that when this time arrives the task must be committed to one of technical training. We suggest the time is not yet ripe, for surely the case of New York province alone is a standing traverse of Professor Andrews's averment that the jurisdiction of the early vice-admiralty courts (seventeenth century) was limited and of doubtful legality on the prize side. To a lawyer there can hardly be any question that Colonel Richard Nicolls's commission, read, as it was supposed to be, in conjunction with the patent of the Duke of York, conferred plenary jurisdiction in admiralty cases. This seems to be how Nicolls read it, for not only did he legislate on the admiralty droits (*Colonial Laws of New York*, I, 66), but he in fact held courts which the record itself describes as "admiralty courts" (*H.R., MSS. Surr. Rec., New York*, Liber I, app.).

Professor Andrews goes on to describe the eighteenth century vice-admiralty courts with their civil-law procedure which "forbade" trial by jury (p. 2). This seems a curious way to characterize a jurisprudence which dealt with common-law problems at the constant peril of writs of prohibition (12 *Coke Rep.*, 65; 1 *P. Williams*, 12; *Strange*, 672). It is hardly to be reconciled with Professor Andrews's later statement that the English admiralty had "powers" over felonies committed on the high seas (p. 3), a jurisdiction which he describes as tried in "the criminal division of the High Court sitting as a common law court". This illustrates the dangers of relying upon Blackstone (IV, 268) i preference to modern critical scholarship. The truth of the matter is that juries were not part of the scheme of civil-law procedure, and it was precisely for this reason that by 28 Henry VIII c. 15 it had been provided that felonies on the high seas were to be tried by special commission, directed to the admiral or his deputy "and to iii or iiij other such substantiall persons . . . to here and determyn suche offences after the common course of the lawes of this lande", as if the offences had been committed within the realm. No less an authority than Stephen (*History of the Crim-*

inal Law, II, 19) has pointed out that the three or four substantial persons were always in practice judges of the common-law courts. Since this jurisdiction was exercised by special commission it cannot be properly described as admiralty jurisdiction. Sir William Holdsworth, indeed, has stated bluntly that the effect of 28 Henry VIII c. 15 was to "transfer the criminal jurisdiction of the Admiralty to the judges of the courts of common law" (*History of English Law*, I, 551). Moreover, Professor Andrews does not make clear how English practice here was also carried out in America. For example, in New York, at least as early as 1670, a commission of oyer and terminer issued to try an alleged offence on board a vessel when it was in Maryland waters (*MS. Court of Assizes Minutes, 1665-72*, fo. 542). Again in 1683 a commission of oyer and terminer issued for the purpose of trying felonies on the high seas (*H.R., MSS. Surr. Rec.*, Liber II, fo. 306). As late as the year 1760 such commissions were still issued (*MS. Min. Sup. Ct. Jud. 1756-61*). Professor Andrews fails to indicate how complicated was the foundation of this jurisdiction or to note that 11 & 12 Wm. III c. 7 included felonies, and he makes no mention of the amendments by 4 Geo. I c. 11 § 7 (*cf.* 6 Geo. I c. 19; 8 Geo. I c. 24).

It is not possible to discuss all the points in this introduction with which a lawyer acquainted with colonial records and English practice must take issue. The reviewer cannot, however, pass unchallenged the assumption that the rules adopted in the vice-admiralty were based "on common sense and a smattering of law" (p. 3; *cf.* pp. 15 and 63). This generalization cannot be defended by one who has examined the admiralty papers of any first-rate colonial lawyer like John Chambers, Joseph Murray, or William Smith, jr. The terse colonial judicial records are on the whole a poor index of contemporary legal learning, and one might have expected somewhat more caution from Professor Andrews, who possesses a formidable knowledge of the sources. It is difficult, to be sure, for a layman to distinguish "common sense" from a rule of law where a passage is not rubricked with a citation from the books, and it is precisely for this reason that the history of law should be committed to the lawyer historian.

School of Law,
Columbia University. JULIUS GOEBEL, JR.

Anglo-French Boundary Disputes in the West, 1749-1763. Edited with Introduction and Notes by THEODORE CALVIN PEASE, University of Illinois. [Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library.] (Springfield: the Library. 1936. Pp. clxxi, 607. $2.50.)

RECENTLY, in two meetings where important new state historical projects were under consideration, references were made to undertaking projects and following methods "similar to those which have been followed in Illinois". The reputation for sound scholarship, significant selection, and keen inter-

pretation which the Illinois Historical Collections have had ever since Alvord, James, and Carter set their mold is maintained by this volume. For it the editor undertook to assemble those documents which are essential to the understanding of the boundary controversies in North America between England and France about the middle of the eighteenth century. These documents were secured from the Canadian Archives at Ottawa, various archives in Paris, the Public Record Office and British Museum in London, and the Library of Congress.

In general, the editorial policy followed in printing the documents is acceptable to scholars. Some, however, will question the soundness of the following principle: "Interlineations, passages crossed out or amended, and marginal notations have been included only where they seemed of special significance as indicating a state or change of mind, or the overruling of an inferior by a superior; the final form of drafts has been reproduced" (p. iv). A scholar usually wishes to determine for himself what lines and words are significant. If words are omitted in the text, attention should be called to them in the footnotes.

The translation, carefully checked, is usually satisfactory but does not always possess the smoothness, polish, and regard for idiom which would make clear exact shades of meaning. In a few places errors have crept in which alter the meaning. The following are examples; in each case the printed translation is given first, followed by a suggested substitute translation: p. 61, "du coté de la Riviere d'Oyo", "on the side of the Ohio River"—in the direction of the Ohio River; p. 62, "le progrès des troubles", "the progress of the troubles"—the progress of disagreements; p. 195, "en deça se [*sic*] sa rive", "beyond its bank"—on this side of its bank; p. 195, "mais ils croyent qu'il y auroit moins d'inconvenients", "but they think there will be less inconvenience"—but they think there will be less objection; p. 249, "Il regardoit le Canada comme le boulevard de toutes les autres colonies", "He regarded Canada as the outwork of all other colonies"—He regarded Canada as the highway to all the other colonies; p. 249, "Si en effet le Canada cessoit de contenir les forces qui sont dans la nouvelle angleterre", "If, indeed, Canada no longer contained the forces in New England"—If, indeed, Canada ceased to resist the forces from New England; p. 254, "même celles des autres nations", "as well as those of other nations"—even those of other nations; p. 255, "iroient s'établir depuis le fort aux Boeufs, le long de la rivierre de ce nom, jusqu'à l'Ohio et le fort Duquesne", "would settle at Fort aux Boeufs, along the river so named, as far as the Ohio and Fort Duquesne",—would settle from Fort aux Boeufs, along the river so named, as far as the Ohio and Fort Duquesne.

The 171-page introduction would make a goodly monograph by itself. In it the author interprets the mass of documents in a way that is possible only to one who has lived with his documents for some time. Its most

important contribution is to be found in the pages dealing with the making of the Treaty of Paris. This treaty broke up temporarily the essential unity of the Mississippi Valley and thus led to forty years of economic, political, and diplomatic difficulties.

When the diplomatic historian, however, supports the premise that the unity of the Mississippi Valley was secured by what American and European diplomats did or did not do, he must meet the challenge of the social and economic historian. The latter would put forth the premise that unity depended upon the inevitable and irresistible westward march of the Anglo-Saxon. The unheralded pioneer, with the Mississippi Valley lying at his feet, did not ask permission of far distant diplomats or executives for occupying virgin lands. Carlyle touched on this theme when he wrote: "far away from senate houses, battlefields, and kings' antechambers the mighty tide of thought and action was still rolling on its wondrous course".

Ohio University. A. T. Volwiler.

Population Distribution in Colonial America. By Stella H. Sutherland. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1936. Pp. xxxii, 353. $4.50.)

The collection and evaluation of statistics of population in colonial America, which was so ably begun by such men as Dexter and Rossiter, is of increasing interest to students of all phases of colonial life. The focal point of Dr. Sutherland's study is the year 1775, for which she attempts to establish the size and distribution of the population of each colony and to represent her findings pictorially in three dot maps. She then proceeds to examine the component elements of the population and the influence of such factors as topography, soil fertility, land tenure systems, and economic activity upon the concentration or diffusion of settlement.

Those who have worked with colonial population statistics will appreciate the difficulties of the first part of the task Dr. Sutherland set herself. It is a task well performed. In order to make a dot map, it was necessary to know the number of inhabitants not simply in each colony but at least in each county and if possible in each town and village. In the absence of censuses for 1775, for New Hampshire was the only province to "number the people" in that year, it was necessary to make estimates based upon whatever censuses had been taken between 1765 and 1787 or upon lists of taxables for the same period. Such lists of taxables for Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Georgia had in two instances to be exhumed from unprinted state archive collections and in the other to be arrived at by diligently counting the names in printed but untotaled lists. The problem of the ratio of taxables to the whole population is a knotty one, since those considered taxables differed from colony to colony and were changed by law in the same province from time to time. Dr. Sutherland's methods of calculation are sound though occasionally different from the simpler rules used by

previous scholars, but a fuller exposition of the reasoning used to arrive at these methods would sometimes be desirable. It may be asked, moreover, why the attempt to make an estimate for precisely the year 1775 has been pressed with vigor in some instances and abandoned in others. Why, for example, should an estimate for 1775 be laboriously developed for New York from censuses of 1771 and 1786 and not for New Jersey from the censuses of 1772 and 1784?

The dot maps undoubtedly constitute the most striking contribution. They demonstrate more clearly than figures the greater density of settlement in New England and the gradual thinning out of the population southward. It is, therefore, unfortunate to have to point out shortcomings. The decision to reproduce the maps wholly in black and white was undoubtedly influenced by the matter of expense. Yet the result is that rivers, lakes, and county boundaries are obscure and difficult to trace. Moreover, since the counties and rivers are not named, nor is any key given, the uninitiated will be unable to identify districts mentioned in the text without consulting another map.

This is an illustration of the curious duality of this book. The author does not seem sure whether she is addressing herself to an audience of learned people or to the general reader. In the maps and in the discussions of the technical questions involved in calculating the population of the colonies she requires more understanding of the problem than the general reader is likely to have. In the analysis of the reasons for the distribution of the population she includes material, especially economic material, either so well known as to be hackneyed to the informed person or so detailed that its relation to the determination of settlement seems quite remote. This last is especially true of the appendix table of exports and imports of the colonies in 1771, which is extremely interesting in itself and is, I believe, here printed for the first time, but which seems to have a very indirect relation to the subject of the book.

Brooklyn College. VIRGINIA D. HARRINGTON.

Nancy Shippen, Her Journal Book: The International Romance of a Young Lady of Fashion of Colonial Philadelphia with Letters to Her and about Her. Compiled and edited by ETHEL ARMES. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1935. Pp. 348. $3.50.)

THE great value of the *Journal Book* of Nancy Shippen, discovered by Miss Ethel Armes in an old trunk among musty records and by her edited with scrupulous and loving care, is to provide a probably unique document on the mores of the society people of the Revolutionary period. The daughter of a Philadelphia surgeon, through her mother related to the Lees of Virginia and by marriage to the Livingstons of New York, Nancy Shippen's life reads like one of the sentimental novels which delighted the fair readers

of Madame d'Arblay. The Philadelphia belle could meet the French officers of Louis XVI, dance with Lafayette and Chastellux, receive a courtly compliment from Washington, move in surroundings teeming with intrigues and conspiracies—she paid apparently little attention to the national drama. Great men and famous statesmen pass across the stage but remain in a dim background; Nancy's sentimental life is the whole play.

The story is told mainly in her own words and is not always easy to follow. One might have wished as an introduction a short connected narrative, which would considerably facilitate the task of the reader. Hardly sixteen, courted by no fewer than six beaux, pretty and coquettish, Nancy finally hesitated between two suitors, Henry Beekman Livingston, an attractive "mauvais sujet" whose amorous adventures had brought despair to his mother and family, and a young French attaché, Louis Otto, who became known in later years as Comte de Mosloy and was to play an important part as a diplomat under Napoleon. Unable to choose and not knowing her own heart, she followed hesitatingly her father's will and married the brilliant scoundrel. It took only a few weeks to reveal Nancy's mistake. The retrospective jealousy of her husband over the romance with Otto, his uncontrollable temper, his desire to bring up his bastards under the familial roof, and the birth of a little girl, Peggy, caused a complete estrangement of the young wife from Colonel Livingston. Back in Philadelphia, she thought of fighting to retain the custody of her child, but, finally yielding to her father's entreaties, she sent little Peggy to her maternal grandmother. Again she was alone in Philadelphia longing for her child, finding some diversion in dances, receptions, and parties. There a few years later she found Otto, now a widower, and the old romance started anew under the guise of a sentimental friendship. She probably loved him as much as her coquettish heart was capable of loving and undertook to sue Livingston for a divorce, a long and painful procedure in those days. When it became plain that she could obtain her freedom only by giving up Peggy, she sacrificed her love for Otto, who, on his part, promptly married the daughter of Crèvecœur. In her later years she found some consolation in religion, lived like a recluse, and had at least the joy of seeing her daughter prefer the now bleak Philadelphia house to the Livingston manor and the prospects of a rich inheritance. Some may feel that Nancy Shippen was not as entirely blameless as her editor makes her. At least the documents are given in their entirety, and the reader may pronounce.

The journals cover almost day by day the years 1783 to 1789 and will prove a treasure of information to the historian of manners. The rest of the story is told in the letters of Otto, the letters of Livingston's mother, a woman of strong character, great dignity and understanding, by far the most sympathetic figure of this episode, which throws a cruel light on the lives of some of the "best people" of the eighteenth century.

Princeton University. GILBERT CHINARD.

The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia: A Marginal Colony during the Revolutionary Years. By JOHN BARTLET BREBNER. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1937. Pp. xv, 388. $4.00.)

PROFESSOR Brebner's latest book is based in general on manuscript materials in the Public Archives of Canada at Ottawa, supplemented by those of Nova Scotia at Halifax and by contemporary newspapers and books. He has used some transcripts from the Public Record Office in London, but research in those materials has been limited, since he lists only patent rolls and C.O.5/85 (Gage Correspondence). While he has had access to a vast collection of local and provincial sources, a more extensive use of the Public Record Office materials might have explained further some aspects of the revolutionary movement in that province. The author himself suggests that parts of the book "might repay deeper study", and to this the reviewer would subscribe, particularly for the economic aspects of the Revolution in Noval Scotia.

The author has really presented two studies, one on the Yankee colonization of Nova Scotia, continuing the subject of his earlier book, *New England's Outpost,* and the other on Nova Scotia's adherence to the crown in the American Revolution. In the first the author has given an interesting account of a little-known subject, and one which belongs as much to the study of New England as to that of Nova Scotia. It throws new light on early expansion interests of the hardy Puritan colonizers and calls attention to the fact that not all paths of expansion from New England were westward. The book is interesting also in its treatment of the spread of New England culture and the persistence of those ideas and traditions which have always characterized the New Englander, wherever he made his home.

The chapters on Nova Scotia in the Revolution are less satisfactory because the author appears to be overwhelmed by the contradictory aspects of his subject. He cites, on the one hand, the pro-English proclivities of official and commercial Halifax, influenced by the mother country's promise of reforms, by the removal of an unpopular governor, by need of the parliamentary subsidy, by the strong military and naval position of the city, and by the hope of inheriting some of the trade advantages with the mother country enjoyed by the rebellious colonies. On the other hand, he presents the pro-New England bent of the Yankee settlers, who made up a large part of the population, tempered to neutrality by the weakness of their scattered geographical position and by their fear of losing their lands if rebellion failed. He also gives attention to the attempts of each group to win over the province by propaganda and conquest, but when it comes to relative evaluation of these various factors the path to his conclusions is not clear. Obviously the pattern of his book with its title shows a preconceived belief that the determining factor in deciding the province's loyalism was the neutrality of the Yankee settlers, yet his final paragraph confuses this explanation with the economic factor. "Economically", he says, "Nova Scotia

could neither stand alone nor maintain an effective alliance with New England. . . . In her dependence, she completed her gradual progress out of New England's orbit into Great Britain's . . . . Nova Scotia had insulated and neutralized the New England migrants so thoroughly that as Nova Scotians they had henceforth to look eastward to London for direction and help rather than southwestward to Boston as they had done in the past." The reviewer finds it difficult to understand whether Nova Scotia neutralized the Yankees, or whether the Yankees neutralized the province.

The author's interpretation represents a shift in emphasis rather than a new and convincing theory. If he were to relegate Yankee passivity to the position of being merely one of many factors in determining Nova Scotia's loyalism instead of somewhat hesitatingly assigning to it the chief role, his conclusions would not differ essentially from those previously reached by other writers on the subject. That he was aware of their lack of definiteness is suggested by his statement in the foreword, that his study be "regarded as a fabric of hypotheses which interested readers will modify in the light of their own knowledge and ideas".

Mount Holyoke College. VIOLA F. BARNES.

Education in Pennsylvania, 1801-1835, and its Debt to Roberts Vaux. By JOSEPH J. MCCADDEN. With a Foreword by Edward H. Reisner. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1937. Pp. xi, 372. $3.50.)

THOUGH the constitution of Pennsylvania adopted in 1790 provided for "the establishment of schools throughout the State, in such manner that the poor may be taught gratis", this provision was not put into practical effect until the law of 1834 was passed. Active endeavor to compass this objective was notable during most of this period. There were numerous philanthropic people, many of them Quakers, who promoted the idea of instruction for the poor, while at the same time the growing labor organizations of the city of Philadelphia launched an independent agitation for the same purpose. The two groups were at variance because the latter resented a distinction which branded their children as objects of charity. It is with the first, however, that this study is concerned, for prominent in this circle was Roberts Vaux. He was an organizer and an officer in a multitude of charitable and literary organizations, and he literally spent his life in attending meetings and writing reports. He patronized various educational experiments, particularly the Lancasterian method, and gave practical demonstration of effective school management as chairman of the early Philadelphia school system, established sixteen years before provision was made for a state system.

The author has taken great pains to give an accurate account of the demand for public schools and to demonstrate the part played by Vaux, heretofore neglected, as the author believes, because of the political bias of the early historians. This neglect leads the author to overemphasize

somewhat the importance of Vaux's activities. The book is very elaborately and meticulously organized, so much so that Vaux appears always in formal attire; his personality is overshadowed by his official positions. Vaux was in comfortable circumstances, and he was not sympathetic with the rising labor movement in spite of the fact that he was a Jacksonian Democrat. He could not understand, it seems, why the poor objected to the stigma of a special kind of education for their children, labeled charity. The feelings and efforts of the laboring group deserve a more intensive study which would put Vaux's contribution to popular education in a more realistic setting. A large part of the book is devoted to a detailed picture of the intellectual and philanthropic activity of Philadelphia in the early nineteenth century. The author has made a worthwhile contribution to our little explored cultural history.

The University of Pennsylvania. ROY F. NICHOLS.

Jefferson in Power: The Death Struggle of the Federalists. By CLAUDE G. BOWERS. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1936. Pp. xix, 538. $3.75.)

ADMITTING that he is "frankly partial to Jeffersonian principles and policies", Mr. Claude Bowers has undertaken in this volume to write a natural sequel to his *Jefferson and Hamilton,* published twelve years ago. His aim was primarily to correct "Federalist historians", such as Henry Adams, McMaster, and Channing, and to give a fairer estimate of eight years of Jeffersonian administration. It was also to depict the political strife, verging on rebellion, treason, and secession, around Capitol Hill and in the country at large; to recreate "as flesh and blood the characters of the drama"; and finally to present a vivid picture of the crude and ambitious capital so unfavorably known through the descriptions of Mrs. Smith, Tom Moore, and Gouverneur Morris.

In several of these undertakings Mr. Bowers has succeeded brilliantly. Resorting as much as McMaster to "that rich mine of history in the rough—the newspapers of the time", he has extracted from this vast material picturesque bits of information, choice anecdotes, striking and illuminating items, and he has reconstructed a more vivid picture of Washington life and society than had ever been attempted. The first two chapters, "Mayfair in the Mud" and "Jefferson's Democratic Court", are models of presentation in which history lives again.

The setting thus established, the drama can now proceed. It is at first visualized by Mr. Bowers as a continuation of the duel between Jefferson and Hamilton. Even the author's partiality to Jeffersonian principles does not blind him to the romantic lure of Hamilton's dramatic career, to his loyalty to his country and his genuine patriotism. It is not certain that, being an artist as well as a historian, the author is not at times more attracted by the fearless champion of Federalism than by the more complex and cryptic

character of Jefferson. He is much more severe not only on Aaron Burr, which is quite justified, but on Marshall, whose conduct during the Richmond trial was far from judicial and whose constant and open hatred of Jefferson somewhat mars his reputation. The portrait of John Randolph of Roanoke, an unsettled and unreliable genius burning in a frail body and ending in madness, is done with splendid strokes. Fisher Ames, the fanatic pamphleteer, and Timothy Pickering are served in their own style, and their own invectives turned against themselves. Secret intrigues are unfolded, insincerity and petty treasons are revealed. Jefferson's enemies stand condemned in their own words and in their own works. If this is partisan history, it is fascinating reading. Nor is a touch of human pity absent for the fallen foe, for the lamentable later years of Aaron Burr in New York or the misguided and misspent genius of Fisher Ames.

There again Mr. Bowers is at his best: he takes the reader behind the scenes, in rooms where political combinations are evolved; sordid motives are pitilessly exposed as well as personal hatreds which made some men deaf to the call of their country. If it is a true picture of Jefferson's administration, and the accusations are well documented and supported, the President had to steer a much harder course than is generally recognized. The fight was not as spectacular as the contest with Hamilton; but Jefferson's enemies were more numerous, perhaps less scrupulous, and the tactics employed more foul. This seems to be the first conclusion to draw from Mr. Bowers's book, and it is an important one. Using in many cases the same sources as McMaster, his picture constitutes a necessary counterpart and corrective of the work of his predecessor.

Jefferson's friends and lieutenants were far less picturesque than his enemies. Among them Gallatin was the most active and original. His financial achievements have been somewhat eclipsed by the more spectacular theories of Hamilton, but he did a hard work eminently well. Mr. Bowers, and justly so, is not chary of praise for his courageous reconstruction, consolidation, and reorganization of public finance. After the death of Hamilton, Jefferson is left alone to occupy the center of the stage. To his biographers, the third President of the United States has always been a somewhat mysterious figure, and it is not certain that even Mr. Bowers's book completely clears the mystery. His record is an open book and stands by itself. That he had a universal genius and encyclopedic interests and was thoroughly acquainted with every measure taken under his administration has never been denied. Unfortunately for us, this man who, pen in hand, was so bold in the definition and defense of his political principles had a puritanical restraint and a gentlemanly shyness when it came to the expression of personal feelings. Much of his influence exerted through word of mouth and through his lieutenants in Congress and in the administration remains, for lack of documents, a matter of uncertainty. Specific instances

are Burr's trial, the discussions in Congress over the Louisiana Purchase, and the Embargo. At least Mr. Bowers has vindicated him on many counts. His analysis of the situation created by the Embargo is a welcome corrective of the picture drawn by Henry Adams. The detailed account of the so-called attack on the Federal judiciary is an eloquent and well-drawn argumentation which deserves to be studied by observers of present politics as well as by historians.

To cover in a single volume a period teeming with so many capital events was no easy feat. One may regret, however, that some episodes, like the Lewis and Clark expedition, are treated somewhat sketchily and that some aspects of the Louisiana Purchase are not elaborated upon. On the other hand, Mr. Bowers has carefully refrained from drawing modern applications from his recital of past politics and has not allowed present problems to project themselves against this historical background. Quite justly, this is left to the reader if he is so inclined. This vivid, brilliant, and penetrating piece of work is more than a dramatic presentation of the case for Jefferson; it is a masterly resurrection of old politics and a much needed contribution to the knowledge of a crucial period in the national history.

Princeton University. GILBERT CHINARD.

Roger B. Taney. By CARL BRENT SWISHER. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. x, 608. $5.00.)

THIS must be counted the definitive work on Taney. It is clear, painstaking, and comprehensive and will rank as one of the solid achievements of American biography. The book has every mark of having been built up from the ground, with material quarried from all the printed and manuscript sources, the latter in several instances hitherto unknown. Fact and opinion have been scrupulously winnowed, the chaff of hypothesis separated from the wheat of actuality. Most important, the result is by no means dry-as-dust scholarship, but a living historical portrait. I shall in several instances have to quarrel with the Taney that emerges from these pages, having some chaffy hypotheses of my own as to the authentic stamp of the man's ideas. But the essential fact is that there *is* a Taney that emerges—not an insubstantial fiction but the result of an honest and able attempt to give the shape of a historical figure and his thought.

There has for some time been a feeling that history, acting through her agents the historians, has done something less than justice to Taney. There have in the past two years been thunderings and reverberations of an approaching revaluation, of which Mr. Swisher's book is a part. Louis Boudin, in his *Government by Judiciary* in 1932, took a bold step in revaluing Taney's importance, although his analysis is far different from Mr. Swisher's. Felix Frankfurter's *The Commerce Clause under Marshall, Taney, and Waite* devotes a sharply etched study to Taney, placing him second only to

Marshall in the Supreme Court's history. C. W. Smith's recent *Roger B. Taney: Jacksonian Jurist* gives him a high rank in our political thought. The theme of all these books, and most of all of Mr. Swisher's, is *Taney redivivus*. Until very recently Taney had been regarded as a second-rate figure, notable only because he strove to undo the work of the Marshall court, narrow and localist in his outlook. He had been damned by conservatives for his "partisan" fight in Jackson's Cabinet against the United States Bank and by liberals for his *Dred Scott* decision in support of the slavocracy. He has thus suffered the fate reserved for those whose acts, whatever unity they may have had in their own day, have had that unity shattered by the unfolding of history. It is only recently that the pendulum of opinion has begun to swing back again, partly because we have moved farther away from the tensions of the Civil War and Reconstruction periods but more largely because the expansion of the court's power has made us more concerned about American democracy. And so we go back to Taney, with his Jacksonian rages against financial concentration and corporate power, with his restricted view of the judicial power, as to a road not taken that we might with advantage have traveled.

Mr. Swisher is conscious of performing a work of historical reshaping. He complains, with a bitterness that eats through his scholarly urbanity, of the raw deal that Taney was given by Burgess, Rhodes, and William Graham Sumner. His concern is to vindicate Taney against his detractors and thus to give him the retributive justice that has thus far been denied him. It is clear that in telling Taney's story he has had his eye not only upon the deeds of history but upon the misdeeds of the historians as well. Yet the need of revaluation should not blind us to the fact that the revaluation may itself have a bias. In each period the estimate of Taney has been responsive to the dominant winds of doctrine. Swisher points out quite clearly that Burgess and Rhodes, when they wrote about the Civil War and the events leading up to it, were writing from the viewpoint of Northerners after the victory, and that Channing, McMaster, Bassett, and Sumner, when they wrote about the Bank War, were writing from the viewpoint of latter-day Whigs. Swisher himself would be more or less than human if he did not have a political orientation of his own, and I wish—as Max Weber always advocated—that he had set down the boundaries of his own bias for us to discount. Actually he writes of Taney with the bias of the liberal who distrusts finance-capital, believes in democracy, is skeptical of the solutions that industrialism has imposed, and stresses human rights as against property rights. It is no accident that the book was written in the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In no other climate of opinion could the viewpoint it represents have flourished so. I happen personally to like this bias pretty well, but I think every bias should be recognized and set forth.

It is to Mr. Swisher's credit that, although his primary interest in Taney is in Chief Justice Taney, he has given ample space—perhaps more than ample—to his participation in the Bank War. This was in a sense necessary because, to correct past distortions, a careful scholar had to go back in every case to the original manuscripts and reconstruct the detailed story from them. American financial historians will welcome this emphasis; American constitutional historians will regret it. But a more important question than the apportionment of space is the explanation of a man's mind and career. And I suspect that one reason Swisher dwells on the Bank War period is to underline Taney's essential anti-corporate radicalism.

Taney started as a Whig and became a Jacksonian, hated by the businessmen and bankers of the country and feared by such orthodox Marshallian constitutionalists as Justice Story and Chancellor Kent. Swisher explains this shift by saying that Taney was influenced by the anti-mercantilist bias of the tobacco planters among whom he grew up in the Maryland tidewater region—planters who felt "a deep distrust and dislike for the mercantile and creditor class" and for "the predatory financial interests". While Swisher is on the whole not given overmuch to precipitous generalization, he seems to have a weakness for the environmental approach. The tidewater tobacco economy plays in this book somewhat the same role that the California frontier played in molding Mr. Justice Field's mind in Swisher's first book. I do not by any means want to quarrel with the environmental-class approach. But Swisher's use of it strikes me as being rather too static. Of all instruments of intepretation, that of class and environment should be a moving, complex, dynamic thing. One has to explain not only how the Whig became a fervid Jacksonian, but how the Jacksonian radical—once he came to the Supreme Court—turned out to be a mildish liberal, weighing precedents along with the best of them. And then one must go on to explain how the radical (or liberal) who cared so much about human rights as against property rights became finally the champion of slave property rights in his anti-humanist decisions in the *Dred Scott* and other cases; and how a man who had talked about limiting the judicial power came finally to take one of the revolutionary steps in its expansion.

Previous liberal defenders of Taney have sought to present the *Dred Scott* case as a mistake and an aberration. Swisher, fortunately, does not make any such attempt. For even mistakes have their roots in a man's thinking and need to be integrated with the rest of his actions. The fact is that the *Dred Scott* case is by no means an isolated incident in Taney's development; many of the elements in the *Dred Scott* opinion are to be found in the rest of his work. In his desire not to see *Dred Scott* as an isolated incident, Swisher seeks to make a consistent figure out of Taney, and in the process he swallows *Dred Scott* and much of the social philosophy

of Southern planterism. I believe that the better view is not to seek consistency in Taney so much as continuity—the continuity of a liberal whose anti-corporate bias still leaves him room for a strong property bias, responding with honesty but with a tragic shift of social outlook to the complex tensions of the most bewildering period of American history. Taney had a stubborn personal strength, but he was not one of the makers of history. He was caught in one of the swirling eddies of history, and the result was the gyrations of doctrine that puzzle us.

All of which should make my own bias abundantly clear.

New York City. MAX LERNER.

Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist. Edited by HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR. Volume II, *1846-1851.* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau. 1936. Pp. xvii, 556. $2.00.)

POOR health in his Indiana home and "the envy, jealousy and hatred of some of the malicious dispositions of Lake county", who hated, despised, and cursed him because of his superior endowments were given by Solon Robinson as the reasons why he continued on his agricultural tours, writing for the farm papers. Although he professed to be tired, he seemed to enjoy the relaxation that came from travel. This volume may be expected to have an even wider appeal than that preceding since it covers a greater geographical range, eighteen states and Canada West. Perhaps the most notable of his tours in these years were those in the South, and more than half of this volume is devoted to that section. He describes at great length the plantations of Louisiana and South Carolina and their farming methods. In view of the recent activity in terracing in the section of Georgia around Athens it is interesting to note his comment that the area had suffered from erosion and that it would be further greatly injured unless "the system of side-hill ditching" were adopted. He saw much of the institution of slavery, and, while not condoning it in principle, he spoke kindly of it in practice. He maintained his earlier catholic interests but stressed the need for using fertilizers, especially guano, from which, as the agent for a New York distributor, he expected "to reap a fair percentage of profit" for himself.

The selection of material and editing of this volume maintain the same high standard set in Volume I, but the typography is below expectations, perhaps because of a change of printers. The volume includes a calendar of Robinson's writings for the years 1846 to 1851 and a combined bibliography for the two volumes, which reveals the surprising amount of material covered in the selecting and editing of these volumes. While these writings, being but selections, cannot quite satisfy the research worker, the editorial comments on the items printed will be of material aid, and the whole work will serve to point out the rich store of information available from this able traveler. It is to be regretted that it was not possible to print his writings

in full. With the close of 1851 Robinson definitely located in the East as an editor, and it falls to the part of New York to continue what Indiana has, in these two volumes, so well advanced.

Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago. RUSSELL H. ANDERSON.

William G. Brownlow, Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands. By E. MERTON COULTER. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1937. Pp. vii, 432. $3.50.)

SEVENTY-FIVE years ago, when war and famine and hate swept through the land, there rose a man who would kill and starve and who could hate, some thought for the sheer sake of hating, those who opposed him. This man had himself suffered and starved as he climbed the ladder to prominence and fame. Now, in his hour of power, he would make those he thought had been against him feel the sting of his lash and suffer ostracism and insult. There was little apparent kindness in this man; his every word was charged with vitriolic hate for his opponents; his every act was calculated to help him to power and authority. Such a man was William G. Brownlow, newspaper editor, propagandist, politician, unionist, preacher, governor, and United States senator.

Spiritual and cultural ancestor of the late Huey Long, Brownlow lived by demagogy and by stirring up social and political strife. His story is here told by Dr. Coulter in a discriminating and often sympathetic manner. Brownlow left few letters and no great collection of personal or other data. His life story, however, is recorded in the history of Tennessee and in the columns of the newspapers he edited and published.

Brownlow had no program of social and economic reform; he did nothing to improve or advance the status of the small farmers, the poor whites, or the Negroes. As Dr. Coulter writes: "It became Brownlow's program from the beginning to use his power as dictator to punish those against whom he had a grudge, public or private, and to introduce to Tennessee that new variety of democracy, which made it possible for a small minority to dominate completely the civil and political existence of the vast majority. . . . He found Tennessee financially bankrupt and he proceeded to whip her down into far deeper distress; he found social chaos among Unionists and rebels and he added to their turmoil by setting the Negro upon the back of his former master; in the church organizations he found Christ left out and he locked the door against His return".

Dr. Coulter has told the story of Brownlow's hectic career in an arresting manner. At times, however, he recoils from the extremes of this singular man's conduct and occasionally allows his personal disgust to creep into the narrative. The account illustrates the lengths to which a fanatical zealot with ability can go and how harmful and lasting are the effects of his actions.

As a biography, this book does the best that can be done for Brownlow.

As an interpretation, through the parson's career, of Southern social and political developments of the period, it is not so satisfactory. In spite of the latter limitation, however, Dr. Coulter effectively brings to life a dynamic and powerful personality whose contemporary influence was more than local. No student of the leadership of Southern Unionism can afford to neglect this biography; few are as competent as Dr. Coulter to write it.

There are illustrations, an extensive bibliography, and a useful index.

Great Neck, N. Y. THOMAS ROBSON HAY.

Horace Greeley and the Tribune in the Civil War. By RALPH LEE FAHRNEY, Associate Professor of History, Iowa State Teachers College. (Cedar Rapids: Torch Press. 1936. Pp. 229. $2.50.)

GREELEY was an admirably forceful, eloquent, and consistent leader of public opinion so long as national issues remained fairly simple and clear; he was a fitful, wavering, and highly unreliable leader as soon as national issues became complex and uncertain. This was because his heart was excellent, his head poor. The brightest period of his great editorship lay between 1850 and 1860, when he upheld the cause of freedom in the territories with commanding power. Especially after the introduction of the Kansas-Nebraska bill the *Tribune* was terrible as an army with banners. The darkest period of his editorship lay between 1861 and 1865, when his intellect could ill cope with the intricate and kaleidoscopic problems of the war, and his emotions were torn between a desire to press on to the extinction of slavery and a wish to stop the holocaust of young lives. It is with this dark period that Mr. Fahrney very capably and thoroughly deals. He has analyzed with great care the position of the *Tribune* on the successive problems in the forefront of Northern attention: the candidacy of Seward, the nomination of Lincoln, the question of peaceable secession, the proposals for compromise, Lincoln's military policy, his border state policy, emancipation, foreign intervention, and so on to the end of the war and the emergence of Reconstruction as the grand topic of debate. Mr. Fahrney's book is well outlined; it represents thorough research not only in the files of the *Tribune* but in a great mass of printed material on the war; and it is well written. While nothing startlingly new is developed in the volume, it is useful both to the historian and the student of journalism. For the former it offers the best guide through the mazes of the shuttlecock, loop-the-loop policy followed by the emotional editor of the *Tribune;* the latter will find in it an explanation of how the most influential journal of the land in 1861 became one of the most distrusted, if not ridiculed, four years later.

The book is decidedly too limited on the economic and financial side. No attention is paid to the *Tribune's* position on the wartime tariffs, on the greenbacks and Chase's other financial measures, on speculation, industrial

expansion, and the labor question. Rather curiously, virtually nothing appears on the draft. The author has fairly confined himself to military affairs, diplomacy, and politics. While in dealing with the last topic he shows expertness, it might be questioned whether he has sufficiently related Greeley's course to that of the Radical branch of the Republican party in Congress and (as led by Chase) in the Cabinet. Nor does he ever give the reader a really deep insight into Greeley's personality or his editorial methods. But these defects are limitations rather than positive faults in an excellent monograph.

Columbia University. ALLAN NEVINS.

Why was Lincoln Murdered? By OTTO EISENSCHIML. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1937. Pp. x, 503. $3.50.)

IF inference were history, *Why was Lincoln Murdered?* would take its place as one of the most significant books in a generation. As things stand, however, it probably will affect Lincoln scholarship only mildly. Certainly it does not require "the re-writing, not only of the history of Lincoln's death, but also that of the whole Civil War period", as the dust-wrapper rather rashly claims.

Written by a Chicago chemist with a flair for history, the volume embodies a prodigious amount of research into unassailable sources and enunciates the highest ideals of objectivity. "Research should be undertaken with a microscope", says Mr. Eisenschiml, "not with a brief case." Nevertheless, this is not an objective study. It sustains a definite thesis not inherent in the facts, which, although not positively asserted, is presented by indirection. The casual reader is led by means of innuendoes, ironical quips, and a liberal use of rhetorical questions to infer certain "appalling implications" which the author apparently believes but for which he prefers not to take responsibility. Mr. Eisenschiml protects himself from the main "implication" by admitting that "there is not a shred of evidence in existence" to substantiate it and by concluding that no one really knows why Lincoln was murdered. But throughout his study he drives home the point that many strange incidents are easily explained by the hypothesis that Booth had a powerful ally in official circles.

Broadly speaking, the chief "implications" of the book are that the Radicals deliberately prolonged the Civil War to ensure abolition and the political crippling of the South. In 1865, learning that Lincoln intended to thwart their ambitions by restoring the South to its former rights, they deemed it necessary to rid themselves of him. Stanton, expecting to dominate the government until 1868, when he intended to make himself President, arranged for the assassination of Lincoln and Seward and used his powerful office to ensure escape, as well as success, to Booth. The shooting of Booth and the workmanlike disposal of his associates represented Stan-

ton's efforts to cover up. The climax of the grand conspiracy was Johnson's impeachment, but "Destiny" (p. 432) intervened to deny it fruition.

Numerous objections to this hypothesis readily appear. For example, Booth's object, until the last day, was kidnaping, not murder. Furthermore, the weight of the positive evidence thus far uncovered indicates overwhelmingly that he acted solely on his own responsibility, striking for what he believed to be the interests of the South and personal notoriety. Finally, it seems unlikely that a Stanton-Radical conspiracy, embracing so many ramifications and subagents, could have left no tangible clues.

Some specific slips mar the work. Thus Booth's approach to the presidential box was far from "unheard and unseen". Parker could hardly have been "criminally negligent", yet have intercepted both Hanscom and Booth. Fletcher was treated no differently at the Anacostia bridge than Booth and Herold. Booth's description *was* sent out officially—on the reward posters. It is difficult, however, to understand how the lifting of the Eckert incident (p. 33) and Attorney General Bates's statement (p. 437) from their contexts could have been mere slips.

The text is profusely illustrated. An appendix includes sixteen plates of documentary material and forty-three pages of supplementary notes. There is no bibliography, but the careful documentation makes up for this defect.

Colgate University. CHARLES R. WILSON.

Selected Writings of Abram S. Hewitt. Edited by ALLAN NEVINS. With an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1937. Pp. x, 414. $3.50.)

THIS volume of selected writings is a useful supplement to the biography of Abram S. Hewitt which Professor Nevins gave us two years ago. Such collections of miscellaneous and occasional articles, addresses, reports, and letters naturally lack unity and have little continuing thread of interest except the author's personality, but in the present case the writer played a large enough part in the events of his time to make these records readable as well as permanently valuable.

The editor has included two short autobiographical papers, a significant group of papers on iron and steel, among which is Hewitt's classic report on the state of this industry in Europe at the time of the Paris Exposition of 1867, seven political papers of which the secret history of the disputed election of 1876-77 will command first attention, papers on capital and labor, New York City government and education, and a concluding sheaf of letters. Although the secret history of the Tilden-Hayes election has already supplied material for three chapters of Professor Nevins's biography of Hewitt, it remains the outstanding document of the book. Every economic historian will thank the editor for making accessible the four papers on iron and steel and the Stevens Institute address. But his indebted-

ness to this volume will not stop there. Data on prices, engineering costs, early municipal traction, and other topics for which authoritative contemporary information is growing scarce are scattered through the other papers and letters. The student of currency and tariffs will find in the letters and political papers illuminating historical side lights on those subjects.

New Deal labor champions may learn with surprise that this prewar capitalist and prominent ironmaster of more than fifty years ago held opinions on the questions they have at heart in many ways as advanced as their own. For example, he declared on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1884, with a confidence that outran subsequent events: "Thank God, the time is at hand, and will surely come in my time I hope, when the workmen themselves will be the owners of all the machinery upon which they expend their daily toil and shall themselves have whatever profits the God of Nature intended them to have as the fruit of their labor." He believed with liberals of the Thorold Rogers type "that the wage-earning classes of the world have no hope except in freedom of trade and labor partnerships". Hewitt was far from being a socialist—indeed he was steeped in the individualist philosophy of the last century—but his ideas of employee relations might be thought radical today in Pittsburgh or Detroit.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

The United States and the Republic of Panama. By WILLIAM D. MCCAIN. With a Foreword by J. Fred Rippy. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1937. Pp. xv, 278. $3.00.)

THE Isthmus of Panama has had and doubtless will continue to have a prominent place in diplomatic history. Its fate was predetermined by its geographic conditions. Possessing the most feasible routes of communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific, it inevitably became an object of rivalry between the maritime nations of the earth. Under the dominion of Spain, it was subjected to repeated assaults intended to wrest it from the hands of the metropolis. As a part of the Republic of Colombia, it was still disturbed, still fearful of foreign aggression. Separated from Colombia and established as a republic under the aegis of the United States, it remained a scene of conflict, but it was now an active participant and not, as before, a passive victim. Under the new order the young republic is seen striving to prevent its individuality from being dwarfed into insignificance by the overshadowing canal enterprise.

To this contest, beginning in the middle of 1904 and extending to the present time, Dr. McCain devotes all but one brief chapter of his book. This chapter, entitled "Four Tumultuous Centuries", treats of all that goes before. Intended to sketch in the background, it fails, however, to bring into sufficiently bold relief the essential features of the scene. The next chapter

is better. It deals with what the author calls the first major controversy, that is, the dispute over the exercise of sovereignty by the United States in matters relating to ports of entry, customhouses, and postal regulations in the Canal Zone. The succeeding chapters deal with the disbandment of the Panaman (the author prefers Panamanian) army, the maintenance of order, the investment of American capital in the isthmus, the boundary dispute with Costa Rica, the appropriation of lands for the canal, transportation and communication, the World War, the proposed treaty of 1926, and, finally, Panama and the New Deal.

The materials available to the author in the preparation of his work were on the whole abundant. For the earlier chapters he had access to the manuscript materials in the Department of State in addition to such published correspondence as is found in the *Foreign Relations* of the United States and the *Memorias* of Panama. These materials begin to thin out, however, as the story proceeds towards the present: first, the manuscript materials of the Department of State fail after 1906; next, the *Foreign Relations,* after 1921; and finally, the *Memorias,* after 1932. What is true of these main sources is true of the others as well; that is, they become less and less profuse toward the end. Consequently the later chapters are not so well grounded as the earlier ones, the last being perhaps the least satisfactory of all. The reader is likely, therefore, to begin the book with a bad impression and end it with a bad impression. But if he reads carefully from beginning to end, the sum total of his impressions will not be bad, for the middle chapters are good, some of them very good. Despite other defects, such as an excessive emphasis on the element of friction, an occasional error of fact, careless writing in spots, the annoying use of Spanish locutions where exact English equivalents are available, and a number of slips in proofreading, the balance remains very much in the author's favor. In his foreword Professor Rippy comments with discernment on the Caribbean policy of the United States.

University of California at Los Angeles. JOSEPH B. LOCKEY.

Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies. By ALEX MATHEWS ARNETT, Professor of History in the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1937. Pp. xii, 341. $3.00.)

THIS book escapes clear classification; some portions of it are biography, some are critical monographs on controversial topics, some are political history. In addition to Kitchin's papers a wide range of sources has been used, though, conspicuously, governmental publications of diplomatic correspondence are not cited.

The author's basic interpretation, which was Kitchin's also, is that the entrance of the United States into the World War was a tragic mistake.

He argues that it was made because of indefensible profit seeking, incompetent statesmanship in high places, victimization of Americans by propaganda, and weakness of peace forces. Since no significant new evidence in support of this interpretation is presented, the Kitchin papers apparently contain little additional information on the matter.

Representative Kitchin of North Carolina is shown to have been a courageous fighter, a man of humor and fire. Although he was not a great statesman as to either domestic or foreign issues, he was an able majority leader and a self-reliant thinker. Before neutrality he supported Wilson's reform measures; during neutrality he opposed Wilson's neutrality policies whenever they seemed to jeopardize assured peace; and after neutrality was abandoned he attempted to make profiteers pay the cost of the war as far as possible. The second phase was the most important. He clashed quickly with the President on preparedness, but his judgment as late as January, 1916, was that Wilson had made "the best President since the Civil War" (p. 72). The severest strain between the two developed over policies on travel and trade.

Kitchin's claim that "We kept *him* out of war" is accepted by Professor Arnett as justified. That controversial opinion rests in considerable measure on whether Wilson declared a desire for war with Germany in a so-called "Sunrise Conference" in April, 1916. This reviewer does not find that the promise of "significant light" (p. 183) upon this subject is fulfilled: reminiscence is the only evidence presented. The more probable date is February 25; and when Wilson's supposed desire for war was rumored shortly after, Representative Henry D. Flood and President Wilson both issued public statements vigorously denying that the report was true.

One contribution should be emphasized—Professor Arnett's instructive survey, with the perspective of twenty years, of the harsh criticism leveled at Kitchin and others who in time of crisis, when independent thought always has a premium value, dared to express opinions not shared by the dominant majority.

Washington, D. C. HARLEY NOTTER.

NRA Economic Planning. By CHARLES FREDERICK ROOS. [Cowles Commission for Research in Economics.] (Bloomington: Principia Press. 1937. Pp. xxii, 596. $5.00.)

THIS is a history and appraisal of that astonishing two-year experiment in social control and economic planning which was conceived by the executive arm of the Federal government in the feverish spring of 1933, delivered in the following June by the legislature, managed, *sub nomine* "NRA", by the executive for twenty-three months, and snuffed out by the judiciary at the end of May, 1935. Near the end an able and comprehensive appraisal (L. S. Lyon and others, *The National Recovery Administration*, Washing-

ton, 1935) was published by the Brookings Institution. The book here noticed is the first substantial post-mortem to get into print. It was shortly followed by the governmentally sponsored "official" summary of the NRA experience by the President's Committee of Industrial Analysis (J. M. Clark and others, *The National Recovery Administration,* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1937).

Dr. Roos's volume is done with ability and painstaking care by an alumnus of the defunct enterprise to which the book is devoted. The author was Director of Research in the NRA during the major part of its short life. He brought to his task of recital, analysis, and appraisal, therefore, the intimate knowledge of the "inner life" of NRA that only an active participant in it could have. Yet his book is anything but a sentimental literary monument to his alma mater by an "old grad". It is almost as objective as if it had been written by J. M. Keynes and scarcely less critical than if it had been written by Lewis Douglas.

Dr. Roos presents a carefully documented account of every important phase of NRA activity, and his discussion of many of them is implemented by acute and critical economic analysis. Among the valuable documentary items in the appendix are a list of approved codes and the texts of the National Industrial Recovery Act and of the Supreme Court's opinion invalidating it. In final evaluation Dr. Roos (p. 472) expresses it as his conviction that "despite laudable reform efforts to abolish child labor, to eliminate intolerable unfair trade practices, to make competition function more smoothly through open prices, and, most important, to promote discussion of economic issues, the NRA must, as a whole, be regarded as a sincere but ineffective effort to alleviate depression".

Columbia University. P. F. Brissenden.

Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts. By Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1937. Pp. xviii, 604. $5.00.)

This study of Middletown is perhaps even more valuable to the historian than was the original volume.

In writing social history, historians have tended to deal largely with the life of the more articulate members of society, depending heavily upon the evidence provided by those who wrote and spoke and practiced the literate professions. They have tended toward a piecemeal description of specific aspects of living, without regard for the culture pattern of which these aspects are a part. The first "Middletown" made a significant contribution to the writing of social history by seeking evidence from the inarticulate and, particularly, by describing the community in terms of the processes of living common to all times and places, *e.g.,* getting a living, making a home, rearing the young—treating each aspect in terms of the culture pattern of the community.

The second "Middletown" makes a further contribution by directing its inquiry to the central problem of the historian, the *process* of change. While historians have often been content with a record of the evidences of change, the authors of this volume have derived from such evidences hypotheses as to the process of change and have appraised the ten year development of this community in terms of these hypotheses. They have indicated what they find to be the most significant developments of these years by adding to the outline of the original study two chapters, one dealing with the concentration of control and power in the hands of the leading family in the community and the other discussing the adjustments made to a situation in which a large part of the population had lost its functional place in the life of the community and had to be supported by relief. They have shown the process of change through the ways in which the community first resisted the recognition that its institutions were failing, then resisted in theory while accepting in fact the exercise of public responsibility, and, as soon as the pressure of the depression was somewhat relieved, hastened to reassert its old faith in the institutions and values which it had seen break down during the preceding years. They leave as an open question the problem of how far this experience has basically reshaped the culture pattern of the community and how much residue it has left which may provide a basis for developments in succeeding years.

Although both these volumes point a way of handling social history which historians may follow to great advantage, they are not wholly free from the same weakness which has beset social historians. In securing material for this second volume the authors spent all too brief a period in the community itself and, consequently, relied overheavily on the judgments of leaders in various walks of life, the columns of the press, and other expressions of the literate elements in the community. With respect to what had been going on within the homes of Middletown they were able to do little more than speculate. Their conclusions as to what the depression had done to basic habits and attitudes were reached without an adequate sampling of the rank and file of industrial workers. They left unexplored the possibility that a strong undercurrent might exist beneath the open-shop exterior maintained by the force of special police and the possibility that the recipients of relief might have come through the depression with an attitude toward the role of government and the relation between federal and local authority very different from the attitude which they found among the taxpayers. Yet a realization of these shortcomings serves only to emphasize the service which these volumes perform in pointing a way to those historians who would penetrate below the surface of the societies whose story they tell.

American University. CAROLINE F. WARE.

Caste and Class in a Southern Town. By JOHN DOLLARD. [The Institute of Human Relations.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1937. Pp. 502. $3.50.)

THIS is a suggestive book for historians. It calls to mind the Lynds' *Middletown,* which indicated to historians—or should have indicated—the value of describing a social situation *in toto* for a given time, in the course of a general historical and interpretive narrative.

"Middletown" was described from an institutional point of view; "Southerntown" is here described from an individualistic point of view—as seen, that is, from the vantage point of a sociologist with psychiatric and psychoanalytic training. Dr. Dollard describes the attitudes of typical whites and Negroes of various classes, towards themselves and towards each other, as these attitudes have been conditioned by race relationships. His studies are designed to give a cross section in time of the personalities developed by the history of race relations, as *Middletown* gave such a cross section of the general social institutions developed by the history of Muncie.

The psychological techniques employed by Dr. Dollard have turned up many fruitful ideas, and some of them contribute fruitful suggestions to the analysis of "Southerntown". Such, for example, is the exposition, in chapter XIII, of the theory that the "frustration" of the Negro group's "aggressive tentatives" vis-à-vis whites accounts for quarrelsomeness and factionalism among Negroes. Such, again, is the interpretation implicit in a statement on page 321: "If southern white people were all thoroughly socialized, we might expect that their aggression against the Negroes would be proportionate to the cause inciting it. This, however, cannot be assumed. . . . White persons who are sadistically motivated due to childhood experience will find [the Southern] social pattern a comfortable one".

With this much said as to the suggestive merits of Dr. Dollard's work, it is regrettably necessary to point out serious defects in execution. These arise, in the view of this writer, from the attempt to make psychological techniques carry the whole weight of the narrative and interpretation, a weight which these techniques can certainly not yet carry. As a result we have a volume excessive in length, in which pithiness, vividness, and organization are sacrificed to build up a weighty façade of science unsuitable to the subject matter in hand.

It seems clear that overconfidence in a narrowly conceived "scientific method" led Dr. Dollard to ignore the literature on race until after his field experience (p. 31). Had he steeped himself more in this literature, would he still have devoted pages (pp. 68 ff.) to making a point, with extensive examples, already covered by Herskovits and by now become familiar ground? Would he have fallen for stale legends like the one recited on page 177? Is anything gained by writing of "a minim of force in . . . public opinion" (p. 9) or of the legendary Negro odor "rising above the threshold

of discrimination" (p. 380), instead of using simpler locutions without laboratory overtones?

Are race antagonisms any better understood by assimilation to Freud's Oedipus complex (ch. XVIII to p. 438)? The Negro is regarded in the South as a child; therefore whites stand *in loco parentis;* therefore all white women assume the role of mothers; therefore Negro sex relations with white women become incest; and this explains the Southern horror of rape. The Greek logicians had a name for this.

Dr. Dollard gives us a "scientist's" account of a Negro revival sermon (pp. 220 ff.). This should be compared with James Weldon Johnson's wholly unscientific rendering of the same subject in *God's Trombones.* If the primary purpose of language is communication, it will then become clear that "social science", as Dr. Dollard practices it, badly needs less "science" and more art.

Nevertheless, historians will do well to look through this volume. Beneath its pseudoscientific excrescences lurks an interpretive method which could serve them well. Since they belong to a well-established craft, it is probable that they would be less inclined to overdo this method than are the more upstart social sciences that have nothing else to go on.

The National Archives. PAUL LEWINSON.

NOTICES OF OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GENERAL HISTORY

Internationaler Archivführer. Edited for the Kommission für Archivfragen des Internationalen Ausschusses für Geschichtswissenschaft by HANS NABOLZ and PAUL KLÄUI. (Zurich, Rascher, 1936, pp. 110, (1), 2.40 M.) This little handbook is designed principally for historical workers as a guide to research in the various national and departmental archives of the world. It gives information of their general organization and accessibility, what formalities must be followed in their use, what classes of archives exist and what periods are available or under restraint, and, if possible, how copying may be done and how photographic or other process copies may be purchased. Europe (pp. 10-92) is well done, but the rest of the world (pp. 92-110) is unsatisfactory. VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

International Bibliography of Historical Sciences. Volume IX, *1934.* Edited for the International Committee of Historical Sciences, Zurich. (New York, H. W. Wilson, 1936, pp. xliii, 487. $10.65.) This volume has appeared only about a year behind the desired schedule, which means that the other accumulated arrears can be cared for by the completion of one more volume in addition to the regular annual publication. The preface to the present volume informs us that various "modifications of method and presentation", following suggestions of "careful and competent reviewers", as well as some suggested by editorial experience, will be introduced in the next volume. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Doctoral Dissertations accepted by American Universities, 1936-1937. [Number 4.] Edited by DONALD B. GILCHRIST. (New York, H. W. Wilson, 1937, pp. xiv, 105. $2.00.) The editor states that in regard to the practices of printing and loaning theses the "picture changes but slightly, and no marked 'trends' appear, save the increasing prevalence of published abstracts".

Sporting Books in the Huntington Library. Compiled by LYLE H. WRIGHT. [Huntington Library Lists, No. 2.] (San Marino, Huntington Library, 1937, pp. vii, 132.) Of value to the social historian is this bibliography on sports and recreation. Although no conclusions can be drawn from this bibliography alone as to the relative popularity of the various sports, it is interesting to see that the books on angling far outnumber those on any other sport.

The Dangerous Sea: The Mediterranean and its Future. By GEORGE SLOCOMBE. (New York, Macmillan, 1937, pp. 286, $2.50.) This popular and readable book by a well-known English correspondent discusses the myriad conflicting interests in the Mediterranean "from the days of Homer's heroes and their 'wine-dark sea'" down to the recent conquest of Ethiopia. There is no index.

A Brief Sketch of the History of the Transmission of the Bible down to the Revised English Version of 1881-1895. By HENRY GUPPY. (Manchester, University Press, 1936, pp. xi, 70, 2s.) This pamphlet by the librarian of the John Rylands Library is a compendium of useful information about the Bible, which gives not only an account of texts and manuscripts but also a description of the historical circumstances which led to successive translations, with particular reference to how we obtained the famous English versions. Ancient Hebrew and Greek texts

are explained, with mention of recent discoveries and of the places where important manuscripts are preserved. The Latin "Vulgate", Syriac and Coptic versions, and Aramaic Targums are succinctly described. Early English paraphrases are shown to have prepared the way for the more thorough work of Wycliffe and his collaborators. The outstanding figure is Tindale, who left the impress of his individuality and scholarship upon the many notable editions of the Bible published after his death. The formative influence of translations upon the English language is properly emphasized. The "Authorized Version", ascribed to King James I, is the classic example. Its pre-eminent place is due not to any official decree but to the universal appeal of its simple and beautiful diction. Highly desirable as familiarity with it is, it would be contrary to all traditions of scholarship if efforts to provide further translations should cease. A minor criticism of the pamphlet here reviewed is that the reasons for a revision are not made sufficiently clear. The four hundredth anniversary of the official act which made the Bible accessible to the people in every parish church will be celebrated in England next year, and an educative program in schools and colleges is now being prepared. This small pamphlet by Dr. Guppy is therefore timely and can readily be made a means of increasing a knowledge of the Bible and its influence.

RAYMOND C. KNOX.

A History of the Economic and Social Progress of European Peoples. By WALTER W. JENNINGS. (Lexington, Kernel Press, 1936, pp. xiii, 713, $3.50.) There are tourists who stick to the highway and tourists who cannot resist every tempting bypath and country road. The latter sort have the most fun, and their experiences are the most interesting, but it is not seldom confusing to try to follow their guidance. The present volume, considered as almost anything but historical narrative, is interesting and valuable. The author divides his material into four sections—ancient, medieval, early modern, and the period since 1800—but within each section the treatment is almost entirely topical. In the last section particularly, which occupies a little more than half of the book, this results in some chronological confusion. Thus the agricultural aspects of the Russian Five Year Plan are discussed on page 393 and its effect on internal trade on page 656, and the last pages of chapter xxv discuss fascism, though the chapter itself is headed "Growth of Socialism". Again, there seems no particular reason why the section on the period since 1800 should begin with an account of Turkey and the Balkans nor why the section on early modern history should start with a chapter —a most interesting and amusing one in itself—on the opinions expressed by travelers of different nationalities about each others' countries. On the other hand, few books contain a more varied and interesting mass of material on the economic folkways of different ages and peoples, and there is much useful information and many convenient statistical graphs to illustrate almost every phase of economic development. As a topical reference work the book will have the utility which it lacks as a consecutive history.

PRESTON SLOSSON.

The Geography of Europe. By GEORGE D. HUBBARD. (New York, Appleton-Century, 1937, pp. xii, 876, $5.00.) The author has aimed to write a book "of interest to students in European history, economics, political science, sociology, and diplomatic service, and to furnish information to the traveler and the general reader". The geographical material on Spain is of particular interest.

Treasure Trove in Law and Practice, from the Earliest Time to the Present Day. By Sir GEORGE HILL. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. 311, $7.00.) In 1930 the author published an article in the *Antiquaries Journal* entitled "The

Law and Practice of Treasure Trove"; in the present work he gives us a comprehensive collection of materials on the subject with his conclusions. The volume traces the history of the law of treasure trove in various countries from antiquity to the present. Especial reference is made to the law in Great Britain, with descriptions of the administrative machinery, digests of cases, and a list of grants of treasure trove from Henry I to George IV. Treasure trove consists of hidden wealth which is found, the owner of which is unknown. Two rival systems of law are traced from the later empire: the Germanic, which gave treasure trove to the prince; and the Roman, which, wherever it penetrated, was generous to the finder and the landowner. In Germany the penetration of Roman law proceeded from the fourteenth century until it had gained full acceptance by the close of the fifteenth. In Great Britain the first complete statement of the law is found in Bracton, where treasure trove is included among the regalia along with wreck of the sea and royal fish. Blackstone likewise gave treasure trove to the king, but by his time this revenue, with the other *jura regalia,* had been granted away, largely to liberties and franchises. Today treasure trove belongs to the crown, but it is a matter principally of antiquarian interest. Students of colonial history will remember that treasure trove was included in the proprietary charters. It was prized in Bermuda and the West Indies, where there were concealed pirate hoards and treasure salvaged from wrecks.

CYRUS H. KARRAKER.

Some Great Political Idealists of the Christian Era. By F. J. C. HEARNSHAW. (London, George G. Harrap, 1937, pp. 273, 10*s.* 6*d.*) This book consists of Professor Hearnshaw's contributions, revised but not notably improved, to the series of works on social and political ideas of various periods which he has edited. The writers with whom he deals were, in the main, important thinkers—some of them, by all accepted standards, of the first rank. Professor Hearnshaw rarely devotes half an essay to exposition or analysis of his subject's thought and in certain cases seems to have turned to that enterprise as an afterthought. The essays are a melange of biographical data, historical background, accounts of political intrigue and tactics, numerous allusions to obscure events and persons, and sweeping generalizations, not always sound. The book has adequate bibliographies and a brief index.

THOMAS I. COOK.

Irish Monastic and Episcopal Deeds, A.D. 1200-1600, transcribed from the Originals preserved at Kilkenny Castle, with an Appendix of Documents of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries relating to Monastic Property after the Dissolution. Edited by NEWPORT B. WHITE. [Ormond Deeds.] (Dublin, Stationery Office, 1936, pp. xxxi, 368, 17*s.* 6*d.*) This volume, like the Red Book, is to be considered a supplement to the valuable series of Ormond deeds of which three volumes have already appeared under the general editorship of Professor Edmund Curtis. It contains documents of a generally ecclesiastical nature which relate especially to monasteries in Kilkenny and Tipperary and in addition many that illustrate various phases of episcopal administration. The foundation charter of Kells (1202-11) is placed first amongst the documents, and further details concerning it are found in the lost register of Kells quoted in one of the appendixes. Other deeds relate to the monasteries of Jerpoint, Holy Cross, and Athassel. The episcopal material is of much interest in view of our need of knowledge regarding medieval ecclesiastical procedure and the competence of church courts. There are documents relating to matrimonial causes, legitimacy of issue, tithes, corrodias, the deposition of an abbess from her office, and specific absolutions and excommunications. Disputes relating to lands and to tithes are frequent, and some of

the land instruments, especially those in one of the appendixes, are important evidence of the grant of church lands to the Butlers after the Dissolution. Several grants in frankalmoign seem to disregard the statute *De religiosis*. An interesting protest is made against the intrusion of an abbot of the Irish "nation", "lest the monastery in question fall into the hands of Irish enemies". Various Irish terms appear, like "houthorn raynids" (cain) and "callupfoide", together with many Irish personal and topographical names. From the nature of the material one cannot expect much information on economic matters. Three excellent indexes are added. N. NEILSON.

The Gun-Founders of England, with a List of English and Continental Gun-Founders from the XIV to the XIX Centuries. By CHARLES FFOULKES. (New York, Macmillan, 1937, pp. xvi, 133, $7.50.) This brief volume, handsomely printed and illustrated, deals with the making of cannon, powder, and shot in England from the earliest times until late in the eighteenth century. In the earlier stages the author surveys the development of the craft on the Continent as well, but his interesting discussion of technical progress deals chiefly with work in England, and with this his firsthand sources are concerned. Other chapters trace the growth of the foundries at London, Woolwich, and elsewhere, which were more or less under official auspices, as well as the small local foundries throughout Kent and Sussex, which flourished from about 1550 until late in the eighteenth century. Although English gun-founders were at work as early as 1353-1360, "England was far behind other nations in this respect". Henry VIII found himself dependent both for powder and guns upon imports from across the channel and brought in armorers and gun-founders from France and Flanders. "The workshops at Greenwich and the Tower, in time turned out armour that competed on equal terms with the finest productions of Milan or Augsburg, and the work of the Italians and Frenchmen in the gun-foundries of London was in no way inferior to the masterpieces of Malines." This home industry served to bring down the prices paid for foreign guns, and with the increasing use of iron during the reign of Elizabeth the infant industry in England became commercially important. "Then the wind turned in another direction. Instructed by the French immigrant founders, iron-workers of the Weald had become so proficient . . . that their productions were in great demand on the Continent. . . . Another important factor was that iron was cheaper than brass. So serious was this exportation of ordnance, that Elizabeth found it necessary to forbid the exportation of cannon, except under license." T. H. THOMAS.

De re militari et bello tractatus. By PIERINO BELLI. Volume I, A Photographic Reproduction of the Edition of 1563, with an Introduction by ARRIGO CAVAGLIERI; Volume II, A Translation of the Text, by HERBERT C. NUTTING. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. 29a, 150; 32a, viii, 411, $7.50.) "In this work, in addition to the discussion of military matters, many points are touched upon incidentally, which concern civil administration. Very essential for all judges." Such is Pierino Belli's own summary of his work. A Piedmontese lawyer, employed for many years in the military administration of Charles V and Philip II, Belli ended his life as a councilor of state of the duke of Savoy. His experience should have qualified him to write usefully on the *res militaris* of his own day, but his discussion of military affairs is based chiefly upon scrappy items drawn from the first ten books of Livy and other classical sources. It is a random and haphazard commentary, without unity, direction, or critical quality of any kind—interesting perhaps as an example of sixteenth century pseudo scholarship but otherwise useless. What-

ever value the book may have lies in its discussion of the laws of war. Professor Cavaglieri's introduction offers a critical appraisal of Belli's work in this respect. After citing much less favorable judgments by Grotius and others, Cavaglieri's conclusion is that Belli deserves "a notable place among the precursors of Grotius". The translation by the late Professor Nutting is in every respect a vast improvement upon the original. Although careful and accurate, it transposes Belli's cramped and crabbed Latin into a clear and readable text. The source references, originally entangled in the running text, have been set out clearly in the margins. Careless and faulty references have been checked and restated accurately, and due note has been taken of loose quotations from classical authors characterized by "slovenly citation, reliance upon memory, and, apparently, even intentional manipulation of the text, together with failure to understand the original". Whatever the intrinsic value of the original treatise, its usefulness to students henceforth will be due in chief part to the scholarship and painstaking labor of the translator. T. H. THOMAS.

The Ottoman Empire and its Successors, 1801-1927, with an Appendix, 1927-1936. By WILLIAM MILLER. [Revised Edition.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1936, pp. xv, 644, $4.75.) This book, as enlarged, continues to be a typical item in the Cambridge Historical series: comprehensive, accurate, solidly factual, noncontroversial, noninterpretative, noneconomic, and devoted to internal political events with pertinent international relations. Characterizations of individuals are few and brief. The enlargement, made in four stages since 1913, consists of the addition of eighty pages to the five hundred pages of apparently unchanged text and of twelve pages to the twenty-one pages of bibliography, the revision of the index in 1927 plus a supplement, the addition of a fifth map, and the revision of the "Table of Rulers". The bibliographical additions are in English, Greek, French, German, and Italian, with none in Turkish, Rumanian, or the Slavic languages. The reviewer of the first edition of this book, some twenty-four years ago (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIX, 355), pointed out the misleading character of the title, *The Ottoman Empire, 1801-1913*, since the Ottoman Empire and the Turks, as represented by the philhellenic author, played a distinctly unimportant role. The addition of the words *and its Successors* reduces but does not entirely remove the objection. In the main index one looks in vain for "Ottoman Empire", "Turkey", or the "Turks". Such a criticism lies with equal force against the added material. Of the thirty-three pages which summarize the history since 1923, fifteen are devoted to Greece and about two in scattered paragraphs and sentences to Turkey. Within its limitations Dr. Miller's book is trustworthy and sound. Serbians perhaps will object to the continued use of the form "Servians", while Bulgarians will note the reference to "Bulgarian atrocities" of 1913 (p. 514), with no apparent knowledge on the author's part of the report of the Carnegie Commission, which revealed the overwhelming percentage of false propaganda in the Greek accusations. A. H. LYBYER.

The Economic Development of France and Germany, 1815-1914. By J. H. CLAPHAM. [Fourth Edition.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1936, pp. ix, 420, $4.25.) In this latest edition of his well-known work the author has made a few changes, especially in chapter I. He tells us that he has not been obliged to modify his general conclusions, although if he were writing the work now for the first time he "might alter the balance a little".

The Diplomatic History of the Bagdad Railroad. By JOHN B. WOLF. [The University of Missouri Studies.] (Columbia, University Press, 1936, pp. 107, $1.25.)

This interesting study makes use of much diplomatic material which was not available to Professor Earle when he published in 1923 his excellent book, *Turkey, the Great Powers, and the Bagdad Railway*. It is valuable, therefore, as supplementing and correcting Professor Earle's work at numerous points and especially as showing the Bagdad Railway as a pawn in the great chess game of international politics. The study is very well written—concise, crisp, well documented, and supplied with a good select bibliography. SIDNEY B. FAY.

The Poland of Pilsudski, 1914-1936. By ROBERT MACHRAY. [Revised Edition.] (New York, Dutton, 1937, pp. 508, $3.75.) Mr. Machray's latest work incorporates the substance of his earlier book, *Poland, 1914-1931*, with three new chapters carrying the narrative five years further. Its general character is very accurately defined in the preface as "a consecutive record, in chronological order, as far as possible, of the day-to-day drama, political, financial and economic, of the restored State, with Pilsudski as its central figure, the whole treated from a sympathetic but not a propagandist point of view". The average reader would probably have preferred to see much less space given to diplomatic junketings and official communiqués and to receive, instead, a few chapters presenting a systematic survey of the remarkable progress made by Poland in many lines since the war and an analysis of the grave problems, domestic and foreign, that confront her. But the author has done what he set out to do, in very informative, readable, and satisfactory fashion. That is something to be grateful for, in view of the dearth of books in English dealing with *Polonia restituta* and in view of the importance of this state, which twenty years ago was only a historic ghost and today is in a fair way to become one of the great powers of Europe.

R. H. LORD.

Geneva versus *Peace*. By COMTE DE SAINT-AULAIRE. Translated by Francis Jackson. (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1937, pp. 272, $2.50.) In metaphors and anecdotes appropriate to the best clubs and dinner tables a former French ambassador to England utterly condemns the League. Its visionary crusaders have promised peace but, actually, have surrendered to the policies of Moscow and Berlin. England and France have been deceived, the latter being left without real security. Regional alliances plus Christianity furnish the solution. The writing is "realistic" and often amusing but not profound, and its disorganization grows tiresome. Carelessness stains this otherwise satisfactory translation of *Genève contre la paix*. Students of international affairs need not take this book very seriously. PHILIP M. BURNETT.

Unhappy Spain. By PIERRE CRABITÈS. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1937, pp. 144, $2.50.) Written from a definitely prochurch point of view, with no attempt to conceal the author's personal convictions, this book, within these limitations, is an able defense of the nationalist cause in the present Spanish conflict. The first 213 pages sketch the history of Spain from the end of the Napoleonic Wars to the current situation, while only 26 pages are devoted to events since the outbreak of the present war. This is understandable, as the conflicting reports from the scene of the war make anything like a reliable account impossible. The author's facts are gleaned entirely from secondary accounts, with some reference to memoirs, and there is no evidence that he has used the extensive newspaper materials for the more recent period or was present in Spain at any time during the past decade. The reviewer believes that the work greatly exaggerates the importance of grand orient masonry in Spain and that the thesis that the loyalists represent a triumph of the Moslem in the Spaniard over

his Christian inheritance is, to say the least, difficult to comprehend. A reading of the chapters in the last volume of Antonio Ballesteros y Beretta's *Historia de España y de su influencia en la historia universal* which treat of the agrarian and industrial problems of modern Spain, with some note of the extensive bibliographies contained therein, would have been useful. The lack of a more detailed discussion of the rise of Spanish radicalism is a serious omission. The name of Pablo Iglesias does not appear in the index! The reviewer is unable to accept as a sound study a work which, among other monographs, fails to mention, let alone use, J. Díaz del Moral's *Historia de las agitaciones campesinas andaluzas* (Madrid, 1929). It is probably what it is intended to be, a partisan presentation written to appeal to a popular audience. ARTHUR S. AITON.

An Atlas of Empire. By J. F. HORRABIN. (New York, Knopf, 1937, pp. xii, 141, iii, $1.50.) In this book, which consists of seventy small but clear black and white maps, the author has provided a "compact illustrated catalogue of those areas of the world's surface which are the property . . . of some . . . alien State". Each map has a brief text opposite it.

ARTICLES

FREDERICK LEWIS ALLEN. One Day in History. *Harper's Mag.*, Nov.

BENEDETTO CROCE. Studii sulla storiografia: La nascita dello storicismo. *Critica*, Sept.

Id. La Naissance de l'historisme. *Rev. Metaphysique et Morale*, July.

JAMES MONAGHAN. A New Source of Information for Historians. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, July.

EDOUARD CHAPUSAT. L'évolution politique de la Suisse. *Rev. Sci. Mor. et Pol.*, Jan.

TH. J. G. LOCHER. Tsjechen en Duitsers in de loop der eeuwen. *Gids*, Aug., Sept.

HARRY JEWELL SARKISS. The Armenian Renaissance, 1500-1863. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

ELIZABETH S. KITE. Early Secret Diplomacy of France and America, 1775-1778. *Légion d'Honneur*, July.

RICHARD H. HEINDEL. American Members of the Geological Society, London. *Pan-American Geologist*, Nov.

LEON S. MARSHALL. The English and American Industrial City of the Nineteenth Century. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

E. C. HELMREICH and C. E. BLACK. The Russo-Bulgarian Military Convention of 1902. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

LOUIS WIRTH and EDWARD A. SHILS. The Literature of Sociology—1935 and 1936. *Social Education*, Oct., Nov.

SEYMOUR DE RICCI. Survey of Manuscripts in the British Isles. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, Nov.

EDGAR ERSKINE HUME. The Army Medical Library of Washington: The Largest Medical Library that has ever Existed. *Isis*, Mar.

H. F. W. JELTES. Mennonites in Dutch Literature. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

LESLIE D. SHAFFER. Quakerism as an International Movement. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.

DOCUMENTS

E. J. KNAPTON. An Unpublished Letter of Mme de Krüdener. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

DEOCH FULTON, ed. A Short Tour through the United States and the Canadas, 1832: The Journal of Lieutenant George Kirwan Carr. *Bull. New York Public Library*, Oct.

ANCIENT HISTORY

T. R. S. Broughton

The Erythrae Decree: Contributions to the Early History of the Delian League and the Peloponnesian Confederacy. By LEO INGEMANN HIGHBY. [*Klio:* Beiträge zur alten Geschichte.] (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1936, pp. viii, 107, 6.50 M.) *I.G.*, I^2, 10, a

lost Athenian inscription known only through a defective copy replete with errors and omissions, one of the most important documents for reconstructing the history of the Pentacontaetia, has engaged the attention of many distinguished scholars within the last century. The problem consists first of all in the proper reconstruction of a difficult text, which is in several places well-nigh hopeless, and in the dating of the original decree. Highby, restoring the document as a *stoichedon* inscription of forty-seven letters to a line, interprets the decree as marking the first arrangement of affairs between Athens and Erythrae and as revealing no usurpation on the part of Athens of the right of administering justice in Erythrae. He dates the decree in the sixties of the fifth century. Conditions are such that to the reviewer certainty on the matter seems unattainable. The restoration occasionally diverges too widely from the faulty transcript to be convincing. But Highby has examined so thoroughly both the work of his predecessors and the sources for the period and has developed the great historical implications of the document with so many excellent suggestions and so much soberness that his egregious study ought to constitute a starting point for all subsequent discussion of the inscription. JAMES H. OLIVER.

Pen and Sword in Greece and Rome. By OLIVER LYMAN SPAULDING. (Princeton, University Press, 1937, pp. viii, 151, $2.00.) Historians, classicists, and soldiers will find this work useful. The books nearest to it are Jähns's *Geschichte der Kriegswissenschaften* and Ludovic Jablonski's *Histoire de l'art militaire*. The latter gives extracts from the military writings of Thucydides, Xenophon, Onasander, Arrian, Caesar, Polybius, Vegetius, and Leo. Colonel Spaulding, whose reputation as a scholar is known to readers of this *Review*, evaluates critically these and other original sources as though they were books newly published. He begins with Homer and Tyrtaeus but omits Herodotus, who describes some very brilliant combined operations. He stresses how like ourselves the ancients were, recommending Xenophon's treatise on *Horsemanship* for cavalry schools. This is moderate, for there is evidence to indicate that in general modern military thought has developed, directly or indirectly, from the philosophy of Socrates as tested and expounded by Xenophon. A striking illustration of how ancient practices have persisted is given on pages 132-133, where excerpts from the *Strategikon* derived from the code of Rufus and similar items from the current American articles of war seemingly derived from the same sources through the military code of Richard II are printed in parallel columns. Colonel Spaulding modestly conceals the fact that he himself has translated the *Strategikon* into English. And perhaps the omission of an index is due to a modest failure to appreciate the extent to which this delightfully written book may be useful for reference.
J. M. SCAMMELL.

GENERAL ARTICLES

R. WEILL. Sur la situation historique et politique de Ras-Shamra. *Rev. Hist. Relig.*, Mar.

R. DUSSAUD. Le nom ancien de la ville de 'Ay en Palestine. *Ibid.*

A. LUCAS. Notes on Myrrh and Stacte. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN. Intimidation in the Athenian Courts. *Class. Philol.*, Oct.

IRENE RINGWOOD ARNOLD. The Shield of Argos. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

STERLING DOW and CHARLES FARWELL EDSON, JR. Chryseis. *Harvard Stud. Class. Philol.*, XLVIII.

FRITZ TAEGER. Isocrates und die Anfänge des hellenistischen Herrscherkultes. *Hermes*, LXXII, no. 3.

HERRMANN BENGTSON. ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΣ Ο ΜΑΚΕΔΩΝ. *Philologus*, XCII, no. 2.

F.-M. ABEL. L'expédition des Grecs à Petra en 312 avant J.-C. *Rev. Bibl.*, July.

ERNST SCHÖNBAUER. Rechtshistorische Urkundenstudien zum griechischen Recht im Zweistromlande. *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, XII, no. 2.

G. DAUX. Notes de chronologie delphique. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LX, no. 2.

A.-E. GIFFARD. Mancipium. *Rev. Philol.*, Oct.

CARLO ALBERTO MASCHI. La solennita della "heredis institutio" nel diritto romano. *Aegyptus*, July.

FRIEDRICH MÜNZER. Die römische Vestalinnen bis zur Kaiserzeit. *Philologus*, XCII, nos. 1, 2.

F. MULLER, JZN. Ameria. *Mnemosyne*, V, no. 3.

G. MICKWITZ. Economic Rationalism in Graeco-Roman Agriculture. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

ERICH KÖSTERMANN. 'Status' als politischer Terminus in der Antike. *Rhein. Museum*, LXXXVI, no. 3.

LEOPOLD WENGER. Juristische Literaturübersicht, VI. *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, XII, no. 2.

ULRICH WILCKEN. Urkundenreferat. *Ibid.*

MARCUS N. TOD and others. Bibliography of Graeco-Roman Egypt. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.

RAYMOND LANTIER. Histoire ancienne de la Péninsule ibérique, 1927-1936. *Rev. Hist., Bull. Crit.*, Apr.

ERIC G. TURNER. The Gerousia of Oxyrhynchus. *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, XII, no. 2.

JOHANNES STROUX. Imperator. *Antike*, XIII, no. 3.

O. TH. SCHULZ. Die Zensus des ersten Prinzeps. *Mnemosyne*, V, no. 3.

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD. Nero and the East. *Harvard Stud. Class. Philol.*, XLVIII.

Id. Contrasting Views of the Roman Empire. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.

ERICH SANDER. Die gestaltenden Kräfte der römischen Kaiserzeit. *Hist. Vierteljahrsch.*, Aug.

NAPHTALI LEWIS. ΜΕΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΑΝΑΚΕΧΩΡΗΚΟΤΩΝ: An Aspect of the Roman Oppression in Egypt. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.

A. GRENIER. Chronique gallo-romaine. *Rev. Études Anc.*, July.

ARTURO SOLARI. La politica orientale del Principato Palmireno. *Philologus*, XCII, no. 2.

W. SESTON. Recherches sur la chronologie du règne de Constantin le grand. *Rev. Études Anc.*, July.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARTICLES

KURT PELÜGER. The Art of the Third and Fifth Dynasties. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.

M. E. L. MALLOWAN. The Syrian City of Til-Barsib. *Antiquity*, Sept.

NELSON GLUECK. A Newly Discovered Nabatean Temple of Atargatis and Hadad at Khirbet et-Tannur, Transjordania. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

W. B. DINSMOOR. Peisistratos, Kleisthenes, Aristeides, Themistokles, oder Kimon? Wer hat der älteren Parthenon begonnen? *Jahrb. Deutsch. Arch. Inst.*, LII, no. 1.

AGNES BALDWIN BRETT. A New Cleopatra Tetradrachm of Ascalon. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

H. DRAGENDORF. Der Altar der Roma und des Augustus in Lugdunum. *Jahrb. Deutsch. Arch. Inst.*, LII, no. 1.

HOWARD COMFORT. Nine *Terra Sigillata* Bowls from Egypt. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

ELIZABETH PIERCE BLEGEN. News Items from Athens. *Ibid.*

A. W. VAN BUREN. News Items from Rome. *Ibid.*

P. LEMERLE. Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologues en Grèce. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LX, no. 2.

A. LAUMONIER. Archéologie carienne. *Ibid.*

LITERARY AND EPIGRAPHICAL ARTICLES

S. H. HOOKE. The Early History of Writing. *Antiquity*, Sept.

W. KOLBE. Diodors Wert für die Geschichte der Pentekontaetie. *Hermes*, LXXII, no. 3.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT. Towns of Asia Minor. *Am. Jour. Philol.*, Oct.

STERLING DOW. Athenian Decrees of 216-212 B. C. *Harvard Stud. Class. Philol.*, XLVIII.

N. G. L. HAMMOND. Diodorus' Narrative of the Sacred War. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, LVII, no. 1.

OLMAR SCHISSEL. Neue Zeugnisse für die ὀκταετηρίς. *Hermes*, LXXII, no. 3.

F. SOKOLOVSKI. En marge d'un décret d'Athènes en l'honneur des éphèbes. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LX, no. 2.

M. Feyel. Études d'épigraphie béotienne. *Ibid.*

A.-E. Contoleon. Anecdota delphica. *Ibid.*

E. Bikerman. Notes sur Polybe. *Rev. Études Grec.*, Apr.

Id. Un document relatif à la persecution d'Antiochus IV Épiphane. *Rev. Hist. Relig.*, Mar.

T. B. Mitford. Contributions to the Epigraphy of Cyprus. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, LVII, no. 1.

Jeanne Vanseveren. Inscriptions de Amorgos et de Chios. *Rev. Philol.*, Oct.

Alfred Klotz. Diodors römische Annalen. *Rhein. Museum*, LXXXVI, no. 3.

Louise Adams Holland. Herodotus, I, 94: A Phocaean Version of an Etruscan Tale. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, July.

Philip H. De Lacy. An Oxyrhyncus Document acknowledging Repayment of a Loan. *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, June.

Arthur Mentz. Die Notae der Germanen bei Tacitus. *Rhein. Museum*, LXXXVI, no. 3.

H. A. Sanders. A Birth Certificate of 138 A. D. *Aegyptus*, July.

Rafael Taubenschlag. Prozesse aus Pacht-, Miets-, Dienst-, und Werkverträgen in den griechischen Papyri. *Arch. f. Papyrusforsch.*, XII, no. 2.

J. Jannoray. À propos de deux dédicaces delphiques de l'époque impériale. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LX, no. 2.

P. Lemerle. Le testament d'un Thrace à Philippes. *Ibid.*

W. H. Buckler. A Charitable Foundation of A. D. 237. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, LVII, no. 2.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

G. C. Boyce

Progress of Mediaeval Studies in the United States and Canada. Bulletin No. 13. By S. Harrison Thomson. (Boulder, Mediaeval Academy of America and the University of Colorado, 1937, pp. 86.) This useful bulletin, now issued biennially, is under the direction of Professor Thomson, who has succeeded the late Professor James F. Willard as editor. In addition to the informing notes of activities of special interest to medievalists there is a list of medievalists and their publications as well as a list of doctoral dissertations in preparation or recently completed. The value of this bulletin would be increased if a subject index were added, so that one could find quickly the names of specialists in the various fields.

Atlas historique. II, *Le Moyen Age.* By Joseph Calmette, with the collaboration of R. Grousset and J.-J. Gruber. (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1936, pp. 18, plates xxiv, 30 fr.) This is an attempt to provide students of medieval history with a handy geographical guide. The attempt is a feeble one. There are only twenty-four maps, as compared with fifty-five on the Middle Age in W. R. Shepherd's *Historical Atlas;* they are not in color; they are overloaded with names; they are folded and hence hard to use; and they are bound in fragile "boards". There is no index of place names and no provision made for finding an unknown city. No dates are given for the economic map with the result that it might be supposed that the data provided by it apply to the entire Middle Age—an obvious impossibility. It is to be urged that the succeeding volumes—*Époque moderne* and *Époque contemporaine*—contain at least a key to locating places and careful time limitations on all the maps. S. B. Clough.

Artes praedicandi: Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au Moyen Age. By Th.-M. Charland. [Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales d'Ottawa.] (Paris, J. Vrin, 1936, pp. 421, 50 fr.) On various occasions M. Étienne Gilson has pleaded for a closer study of the compendiums on the art of preaching which appeared following the mid-thirteenth century. It is these requests which are directly responsible for this excellent study, which is to be placed alongside of

those of Cruel, Owst, Davy, and Canti and near the volumes dealing with university life and custom in the Middle Ages. The rules in these manuals are not those of Roman rhetoric or the precepts of patristic preachers whose homiletics rested frequently on inspiration and native wit; they are rules developed and followed by university professors for addressing audiences composed largely of students and colleagues. M. Charland first lists the authors of the preaching manuals and describes the manuscripts in which these are found. In the second part of his book he scrutinizes carefully the rhetorical theory underlying this practical homiletics, examining principally the treatises of two fourteenth century English writers, Robert of Basevorn and Thomas Waleys, whose contributions he publishes in full. Concerned primarily with theory, the writers of these studies are not completely unaware of reality. In his first chapter Thomas strikingly reflects a mind sensitive to the problems which face the preacher as a public speaker who must at all costs hold the attention of his audience. The many precepts recorded here are as valid today as when they were written. The eleventh caution is *ut caveat sibi praedicator ne sermonis prolixitate auditores fatiget!*

The Development of Charity in Medieval Louvain. By WALTER JOHN MARX. (Yonkers, privately printed, 1936, pp. xiv, 124.) This monograph presents a study of the Archives de l'assistance publique de la ville de Louvain and the Archives de la ville de Louvain (admittedly scant for the medieval period). It is augmented by a comparison with institutions in other Belgian cities, especially with those of Brussels as described in Bonenfant's studies, and also with German institutions as synthesized by Reicke. The author places emphasis on the close resemblance between the Belgian medieval hospital organization and the German. While in most craft guilds such conditions as the lack of insurance against fire, flood, and plague and of facilities for savings deposits against old age were offset by care given to needy members, the textile makers, being subject to the fluctuations of the world market, were dependent on institutional charity. The prosperous burghers gave ample support to a variety of charitable institutions. Municipal control over these institutions increased after 1350, partly owing to a widening of the functions of government curiously contemporary with a successful democratic revolution. The author traces monastic charities to their origin in the Benedictine Rule but is less definite concerning parish charities, beginning as he does with Charlemagne's capitulary of 802. Here the amount of poor relief is defined as one third of the total parish revenues, which presumes a poor relief system once fully developed although at the time in a state of decline. The discussion fails to show that the basis of parish poor relief is in canon law and its historical origins in the xenodochia of the early Christian centuries. The author pays tribute to the expanded Benedictine charities of the Gregorian reform period but treats inadequately the contemporary expansion of parish charities effected by the establishment of orders of canons regular for the maintenance of hospices. The typography, index, and bibliography are commendable.

SISTER ANGÈLE (GLEASON).

An Introduction to Freemasonry. By DOUGLAS KNOOP and G. P. JONES. (Manchester, University Press, 1937, pp. vii, 136, 3*s.* 6*d.*) The two essays in this small volume are based upon and supplement the authors' earlier more extensive publications (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XL, 109, and XLI, 803). Though limited in scope, they supply many interesting and important facts concerning the medieval mason. Bibliographical notes on twenty masons active before 1500 are given in an

appendix. There are also a short bibliography and notes for the text. Logical as it may seem, the reviewer would welcome tangible proof for the surmise that educated masons of the Middle Ages were inspired to design Gothic buildings by their study of geometry (p. 22).

Franciscan Architecture in England. By A. R. MARTIN. [British Society of Franciscan Studies.] (Manchester, University Press, 1937, pp. xxi, 306, 21*s*.) This is a scholarly, well-documented book, provided with an abundance of notes, appendixes, bibliography, photographs, line drawings, and a full index. In frank self-criticism the author observes in his foreword that the "distinctive and highly individual characteristics of the friars' buildings in this country were in no important features peculiar to the Grey Friars". Thus he recognizes that the very term Franciscan architecture is rather a misnomer and that accordingly the restriction of his field to the works of the Franciscan order is open to criticism. The titles of four out of the five chapters which make up the body of the book—"Houses of which Structural Remains Survive", "Houses for which Evidence of Plan Survives", "Houses with Minor Remains or Slight Evidence of Plan", and "Houses of Franciscan Nuns"—suggest a further ground for possible questioning of the significance of the enterprise. They would seem to indicate that the material must be rather scanty. As a matter of fact, surviving examples of this so-called style are by no means abundant. They are, moreover, for the most part of a late date. Thus the author is committed to playing the role of the paleontologist rather than that of the naturalist observing living forms. It is from something like incomplete, damaged fossil remains that he must try to reconstruct the story of the building carried out in England by the followers of St. Francis. This task he performs well, with the patience and the conscience of a scientist. For many readers it is, however, the first, introductory, chapter that will prove to be of the greatest interest. In any case it makes a good prelude to the later chapters. HELEN HUSS PARKHURST.

Les relations politiques et les échanges commerciaux entre le duché de Brabant et l'Angleterre au Moyen Age: L'étape des laines anglaises en Brabant et les origines du développement du port d'Anvers. By J. DE STURLER. (Paris, Droz, 1936, pp. 543, 60 fr.) This is a welcome addition to the tardily accumulating bibliography of studies of the economic and political relations of England and the Low Countries in the Middle Ages. The title requires a slight amendment, as the author realizes (p. 10), which would restrict its scope to the period 1190-1358. The work is most conscientiously done in the Belgian tradition. Published and unpublished English sources are used heavily and balanced by as heavy use of Continental materials. M. de Sturler has several contributions to make beyond a notable use of much detail material. For one thing, he shows that the early importance of Brabant as a textile producing center has not been appreciated. For another, he adds much to our knowledge of the rise of Antwerp and the nature of its activity. In several sections he works out the detailed operations of financial and shipping interests behind political maneuvers. He also shows the use at critical points of financial and business agencies in the game of politics. The "modernity" of such thirteenth century manipulations is arresting. Previous reviews of this book have gone into it more thoroughly than can be done here. The most complete is that of G. Espinas (*Annales d'hist. éc. et soc.*, Jan., 1937, pp. 58-74); E. E. Rich raises questions regarding the staple (*Ec. Hist. Rev.*, May, 1937, pp. 236-38); Hans van Werveke discusses the Belgian side (*Revue belge de phil. et d'hist.*, Jan., 1937, pp. 290-93). R. L. REYNOLDS.

ARTICLES

F. M. POWICKE. Charles Homer Haskins. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Après un siècle. L'oeuvre des Bollandistes de 1837 à 1937. *Analecta Bolland.*, LV, nos. 1-2.

THOMAS P. OAKLEY. Alleviations of Penance in the Continental Penitentials. *Speculum*, Oct.

BRUNO KRUSCH. Die Auferstehung des Königs Chlodwig. *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. Wissen.*, 1937, XV.

A. BRANDL. Vom kosmologischen Denken des heidnisch-christlichen Germanentums: Der früh-ags. Schicksalsspruch der Handschrift Tiberius B. 13 und seine Verwandtheit mit Boethius. *Ibid.*

S. STEIN. Der "Romanus" in den fränkischen Rechtsquellen. *Hist. Vierteljahrsch.*, Aug.

M. CHAUME. Le mode de constitution et de délimitation des paroisses rurales aux temps mérovingiens et carolingiens [cont.]. *Rev. Mabillon*, Apr.

FRIEDRICH LÜTGE. Hufe und Mansus in den mitteldeutschen Quellen der Karolingerzeit, im besonderen in dem Brevarium St. Lulli. *Vierteljahrsch. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXX, no. 2.

GEORG WILHELM SANTE. Bonifatius und die Begründung des Mainzer Erzbistums. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

DIETRICH VON GLADISS. Die Schenkungen der deutschen Könige zu privatem Eigen nach ihrem wirtschaftlichen Inhalt. *Vierteljahrsch. f. Soz.- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXX, no. 2.

MAX BUCHNER. Pseudoisidor und die Hofkapelle Karls des Kahlen. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

FRITZ RÖRIG. Heinrich der Löwe und die Gründung Lübecks: Gründsätzliche Erörterungen zur städtischen Ostsiedlung. *Deutsches Arch. f. Gesch. Mittelal.*, I, no. 2.

T. VENNI. Giovanni X. *Arch. R. Deputaz. Romana Stor. Patria*, N. S., II, 1936.

E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL. Le Cid de l'histoire. *Rev. Hist.*, July.

PERCY ERNST SCHRAMM. Der "Salische Kaiserordo" und Benzo von Alba: Ein neues Zeugnis des Graphia-Kreises. *Deutsches Arch. f. Gesch. Mittelalt.*, I, No. 2.

CARL ERDMANN. Tribur und Rom: Zur Vorgeschichte der Canossafahrt. *Ibid.*

G. MOLLAT. Le droit de patronage en Normandie du XI^e^ au XV^e^ siècle [cont.]. *Rev. Hist. Ecclés.*, July.

THEODOR SCHIEFFER. Ein deutscher Bischof des 11. Jahrhunderts: Gerhard I. von Cambrai. *Deutsches Arch. f. Gesch. Mittelalt.*, I, no. 2.

ROBERT LATOUCHE. Un aspect de la vie rurale dans le Maine au XI^e^ et au XII^e^ siècle: L'établissement des bourgs. *Moyen Age*, June.

DOROTHY M. SCHULLIAN. Valerius Maximus and Walter Map. *Speculum*, Oct.

LEO SANTIFALLER. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kontextschlussformeln der Papsturkunde. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

F. DÖLGER. Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner. *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.*, LVI, no. 1.

J. E. A. JOLLIFFE. Alod and Fee. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, V, no. 3.

PAUL JEULIN. La consistance du "Comté" de Richmond en Angleterre d'après le "Domesday Book". *An. Bretagne*, XLIV, nos. 1-2.

P. DAVID. Le monachisme bénédictin et l'Ordre de Cluny dans la Pologne médiévale [cont.]. *Rev. Mabillon*, Jan., 1937.

T. S. R. BOASE. Recent Developments in Crusading Historiography. *History*, Sept.

RENÉ CROZET. Le voyage d'Urban II et ses négociations avec le clergé de France. *Rev. Hist.*, Apr.

OTTO VEHSE. Ferrareser Fälschungen. *Quellen u. Forsch. Italien. Arch. u. Biblioth.*, XXVII.

P. BONENFANT. Les premiers remparts de Bruxelles. *An. Soc. Roy. Archéol. Bruxelles*, XL.

SYLWIUSZ MIKUCKI. Remarques sur les origines du notariat public en Pologne: Étude diplomatique. *Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr.*, Apr.

EUGEN WOHLHAUPTER. Beiträge zum Recht der Personenbeförderung über See im Mittelalter. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

MARTINIEN VAN DE KERCKHOVE. La notion de juridiction chez les décrétistes et les premiers décrétalistes, 1140-1250. *Études Francis.*, July.

K. Heeringa. Onderzoekingen naar de geschiedenis van ons land vóór het Interregnum. *Bijdr. Vaderland. Gesch. Oudh.*, VIII, nos. 3-4.

E. G. R. Taylor. Ideas of the Shape and Habitability of the Earth prior to the Great Age of Discovery. *History*, June.

André E. Sayous. Les noblesses: Aristocratie et noblesse à Gênes. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, July.

P. L. Leicht. La corporazione delle arti nelle sue origini e nel primo sorgere del comune. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

A. Hayen. Saint Thomas a-t-il édité deux fois son Commentaire sur le livre des Sentences? *Rech. Théol. Anc. et Méd.*, Apr.

Heinrich Günter. Das deutsche Fürstentum und die Reichspolitik im Hochmittelalter. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

Rudolf von Heckel. Studien über die Kanzleiordnung Innozenz' III. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

Martin Grabmann. Die persönlichen Beziehungen des hl. Thomas von Aquin. *Ibid.*

Frank R. Lewis. Ottokar II of Bohemia and the Double Election of 1257. *Speculum*, Oct.

Id. The Election of Richard of Cornwall as Senator of Rome in 1261. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Hermann Menhardt. Heinrichs von Morungen Indienfahrt. *Hist. Vierteljahrsch.*, Aug.

Hugo Dausend. Johannes Damascenus in der Chronik des Salimbene: Ein Beitrag zur Uebersetzungstätigkeit Burgundios von Pisa und Roberts Grosseteste, Bischofs von Lincoln. *Theolog. Quartalsch.*, CXVIII, no. 2.

Basilius Pergamo. De quaestionibus ineditis Fr. Odonis Rigaldi, Fr. Gulielmi de Melitona et Codicis Vat. Lat. 782 circa naturam theologiae deque earum relatione ad Summam theologicam Fr. Alexandri Halensis [cont.]. *Arch. Francis. Hist.*, XXIX, nos. 1-2.

G. G. Coulton. The Inquisition up to Date. *History*, Sept.

M. H. Vicaire. Les Porrétains et l'Avicennisme avant 1215. *Rev. Sci. Philos. et Théol.*, July.

J. Homer Herriott. The 'Lost' Toledo Manuscript of Marco Polo. *Speculum*, Oct.

Yves Revouard. Comment les papes d'Avignon expédiaient leur courrier. *Rev. Hist.*, July.

Charles Verlinden. Draps des Pays-Bas et du nord de la France en Espagne au XIV^e^ siècle. *Moyen Age*, June.

Garrett Mattingly. The First Resident Embassies: Mediaeval Italian Origins of Modern Diplomacy. *Speculum*, Oct.

Ernest William Talbert. The Date of the Composition of the English Wyclifite Collection of Sermons. *Ibid.*

G. Klinge. Die Beziehungen zwischen christlicher und islamischer Theologie im Aufgang des Mittelalters. *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.*, LVI, no. 1.

R. Aubenas. Le servage à Castellane au XIV^e^ siècle. *Rev. Hist. Droit Fr.*, Jan., 1937.

Ludwig Bertalot. Zur Bibliographie der Uebersetzungen des Leonardus Brunus Aretinus. *Quellen u. Forsch. Italien. Arch. u. Biblioth.*, XXVII.

Natali Carotti. Un politico del Quattrocento: Francesco Barbaro. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, June.

Heinrich Finke. Die Nation in den spätmittelalterlichen allgemeinen Konzilien. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

B. L. Ullman. Manuscripts of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Curt F. Bühler. Greek Philosophers in the Literature of the Later Middle Ages. *Speculum*, Oct.

Documents

Hippolyte Delehaye. Quatre miracles de Saint Martin de Tours. *Analecta Bolland.*, LV, nos. 1-2.

Ivan Dujčev. Uno studio inedito di Mons. G. G. Ciampini sul Papa Formoso. *Arch. R. Deputaz. Romana Stor. Patria*, N. S., II, 1936.

Friedrich Bock. Mittelalterliche Kaiserurkunden im alten Urbinater Archiv. *Quellen u. Forsch. Italien. Arch. u. Biblioth.*, XXVII.

O. Oppermann. Die unechte Urkunde des Grafen Robert II von Flandern für S. Donatien zu Brügge von 1089 und Verlindens Kritik der Fontes Egmundenses. *Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist.*, June.

André Wilmart. Poèmes de Gautier de Châtillon dans un manuscrit de Charleville [cont.]. *Rev. Bénédict.*, Apr.

Ferdinand Güterbock. Zur Geschichte Burgunds im Zeitalter Barbarossas. *Zeitsch. f. Schweizerischegesch.*, XVII, no. 2.

A. Landgraf. Drei Zweige der Pseudo-Poitiers-Glosse zu den Sentenzen des Lombarden. *Rech. Théol. Anc. et Méd.*, Apr.

Ch. Higounet. Le style du 1er avril à Toulouse au XIIe et au XIIIe siècles. *An. Midi*, Apr.

Hermann Stobe. Eine unbekannte Urkunde Kaiser Friedrichs II. *Deutsches Arch. f. Gesch. Mittelal.*, I, no. 2.

Mary Dienes. Eastern Missions of the Hungarian Dominicans in the First Half of the Thirteenth Century. *Isis*, Aug.

S. Harrison Thomson. An Unnoticed Treatise of Roger Bacon on Time and Motion. *Ibid.*

D. O. Lottin. Thomas de Sutton, O.P., et le libre arbitre. *Rech. Théol. Anc. et Méd.*, Apr.

P. Glorieux. Le Quodlibet de Pierre de Tarentaise. *Ibid.*

A. Dondaine. La Somme de Simon de Hinton. *Ibid.*

Ildebrando Imberciadori. Constitutum Montis Pinzutuli (Monticello Amiata, secolo XIII). *Bull. Senese Stor. Pat.*, VIII, no. 1.

P. Luigi Sbaragli. I mercanti di mezzana gente al potere in Siena. *Ibid.*

Baudouin de Gaiffier. La vie de S. Conrad d'Herlesheim, d. *ca.* 1270. *Analecta Bolland.*, LV, nos. 1-2.

Hugolin Lippens. La lettre de Simon de Brion en faveur des mendiants (1268) et le soi-disant concile provincial de Reims (1267). *Arch. Franciс. Hist.*, XXIX, nos. 1-2.

H. G. Richardson. Select Documents: XXXIII—The Coronation of Edward I. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, Nov.

Wilfried Krallert. Drei Zinsrodel des Klosters Weingarten von der Wende des 13. zum 14. Jahrhunderts. *Zeitsch. f. Württemberg. Landesgesch.*, I, no. 1.

Friedrich Bock. Studien zum politischen Inquisitionsprozess Johanns XXII. *Quellen u. Forsch. Italien. Arch. u. Biblioth.*, XXVII.

Id. Kaisertum, Kurie und Nationalstaat im Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts. *Röm. Quartalsch.*, XLIV, nos. 3-4.

George L. Haskins. Judicial Proceedings against a Traitor after Boroughbridge, 1322. *Speculum*, Oct.

N. B. Lewis. Simon Burley and Baldwin of Raddington. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

R. Valentini. Gli istituti romani di alta cultura e la presunta crisi dello "Studium urbis", 1370-1420. *Arch. R. Deputaz. Romana Stor. Patria*, N. S., II, 1936.

Karl August Fink. Die Anfänge der Bruderschaft am Deutschen Campo Santo in Rom. *Röm. Quartalsch.*, XLIV, nos. 3-4.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The British Empire

R. L. Schuyler

The Compossicion Booke of Conought. Transcribed by A. Martin Freeman. (Dublin, Stationery Office, 1936, pp. ix, 179, 7*s.* 6*d.*) Mr. Freeman in his scholarly transcription of a seventeenth century copy of this manuscript contributes an addition of note to the publications sponsored by the Irish Manuscripts Commission. The *Compossicion Booke* is an official enrollment of all major landholders within the province of Connaught in the year 1585. It states the extent of each crown grant and lists special privileges accorded to each grantee. It is important to note that all grants are made upon two express conditions, knight service to the crown and renunciation of all Irish customs arising out of Brehon law. These two stipulations give us the key to the historical significance of the enrollment: through it we are enabled to see Elizabeth in the very act of wooing the Irish and Anglo-Irish from their tanist tradition by grant of lands at rents

fantastically low. The *Compossicion Booke* is dated only three years prior to the coming of the Armada, a time when the necessity of strengthening Irish loyalty to the crown was acute. Though consisting of dry, factual records, it has interest for the historian, the antiquarian, and the student of Irish affairs because of its indirect disclosures of social ills then current in Ireland, its identification of place and name, and its side lights upon the English civil and military administration. As a source book it is, of course, a work for the initiate; but to them it will illumine that phase of crown policy which superposed English feudalism and civil law upon the Irish tanist system of chiefship by election and Brehon law and custom. EDWARD M. HINTON.

Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirror for Magistrates". By LILY B. CAMPBELL. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1936, pp. 25, 25 cents.) No one is better qualified to speak about *A Mirror for Magistrates* than Dr. Campbell, who has for years been working upon a scholarly edition of that interesting compound of history, poetry, and morality. In this short lecture she has employed it as an illustration of the disposition of the Tudors to use history as they used tragedy, to point a moral. It is gratifying to discover that she has been tempted to approach her text in that spirit. Too often English scholars are more concerned with the letter than the spirit of their texts. And too often when they attempt interpretation they draw in fantastic historical allusions which have little foundation outside their own perfervid imaginings. Dr. Campbell preserves her balance admirably. Her study in this case is slight, but it establishes her claim to a respectful hearing from social historians and reveals clearly that *A Mirror for Magistrates* is in safe hands. CONYERS READ.

Bermuda and the American Revolution, 1760-1783. By WILFRED BRENTON KERR. (Princeton, University Press, 1936, pp. xii, 142, $2.00.) Professor Kerr has conceived the project of writing the history of the nonrevolutionary British colonies during the period of the American Revolution and offers the volume in hand as a study which "may be the first of a series". While Bermudians were nonrevolutionary and had no desire to share the political fortunes of the rebellious colonies, they were not predominantly loyal. Professor Kerr thinks that the "positively loyal" inhabitants did not number more than one third of the population. The majority—mariners, shipowners, and their employees—he regards as virtual allies of the United States, not because they sympathized with the Americans on grounds of principle but because of business interests. In return for provisions from the rebellious colonies, gunpowder, stored in Bermuda for the use of the king's troops, found its way to Philadelphia and Charleston, and Congress excepted Bermuda from the nonintercourse provisions of the Association of 1774 and exempted Bermudian vessels from capture by American privateers. The dominant commercial interests led the colony into "a passive conflict with the mother country and an association with the Americans which carried Bermuda closest of all the non-revolutionary colonies to the thirteen which separated from the Empire". Professor Kerr's study is based principally on manuscript sources, including the Colonial Office records relating to Bermuda in the Public Record Office, London, the papers of the Continental Congress in the Library of Congress at Washington, and the correspondence of St. George Tucker preserved in Tucker House, Williamsburg, Virginia, which contains many letters and other documents from members of the influential Tucker family in Bermuda.

The History of Quasi-Contract in English Law. By R. M. JACKSON. [Cambridge Studies in English Legal History.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York,

Macmillan, 1936, pp. xxxi, 134, $3.75.) The law of quasi-contract is highly important, for in it the borrowing of law from morals, the molding of law by man's innate sense of fairness, is peculiarly apparent. It had old beginnings, for Mr. Jackson finds abundant Year Book illustrations of the doctrine, and the term dates from the early 1600's. But it is modern as a branch of law of which men have been conscious; the first textbook dealing with it appeared in 1893, and Mr. Jackson's is the first attempt at its history. Characteristically, we are agreed upon neither its definition nor its source. Contract being a rather definite concept, it is customary to "define" a tort as a noncriminal wrong that is not a breach of contract. But this omits the further necessary distinction from wrongs remedied in quasi-contract. Equally characteristically, Mr. Jackson defines those wrongs "in rough outline, as consisting of liability not based on tort or contract" (p. xxi). The "contract" is fictitious; the "promise"—usually one to make restitution for a benefit unjustly received—is imposed by law, and a remedy contractual in form is then allowed upon it. Thus the name involves a tangle with procedure; the curse of the common law's remedial system has hampered analysis, understanding, and development. The whole subject is essentially "equitable" in the sense that the law of quasi-contract was a supplement to older law, allowed (but within the nonequity courts) for the doing of better justice. Whether equity influenced the origins of quasi-contract Mr. Jackson has not investigated. His very scholarly book shows the clumsy hesitancies of development imposed by the necessity of action and reasoning within the common law actions. One learns from it much history of debt, account, and assumpsit. FRANCIS S. PHILBRICK.

ARTICLES

GRAHAM POLLARD. The Company of Stationers before 1557. *Library,* June.

ARTHUR BARKER. Milton's Schoolmasters. *Mod. Lang. Rev.,* Oct.

MARIO M. ROSSI. Lo sbarco inglese nell'Isola di Ré (1627) e la polemica militare nel XVII secolo. *N. Riv. Stor.,* May.

MICHAEL J. HYNES. The Irish Republic in the Seventeenth Century. *Cath. Hist. Rev.,* Oct.

E. S. DE BEER. The Earliest Fellows of the Royal Society. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research,* Nov.

CHARLES FIRTH. The Royalists under the Protectorate. *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* Oct.

CLYDE L. GROSE. The Religion of Restoration England. *Church Hist.,* Sept.

J. H. PLUMB. The Elections to the Convention Parliament of 1689. *Cam. Hist. Jour.,* V, no. 3.

MARJORIE NICOLSON and NORA M. MOHLER. The Scientific Background of Swift's *Voyage to Laputa. An. Science,* July.

H. N. FIELDHOUSE. Bolingbroke and the d'Iberville Correspondence, August 1714-June 1715. *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* Oct.

W. P. JONES. The Vogue of Natural History in England, 1750-1770. *An. Science,* July.

H. BUTTERFIELD. Lord North and Mr. Robinson, 1779. *Cam. Hist. Jour.,* V, no. 3.

G. F. JAMES. Josiah Burchett, Secretary to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, 1695-1742. *Mariner's Mirror,* Oct.

A. H. TAYLOR. William Bligh at Camperdown. *Ibid.*

C. K. WEBSTER. The Accession of Queen Victoria. *History,* June.

C. P. STACEY. The Hudson's Bay Company and Anglo-American Military Rivalries during the Oregon Dispute. *Can. Hist. Rev.,* Sept.

FRANK E. ROSS. The Retreat of the Hudson's Bay Company in the Pacific North-West. *Ibid.*

COLLIN C. DAVIES. India and Queen Victoria. *Asiatic Rev.,* July.

CHARLES FOSTER. One Hundred Years of Science Teaching in Great Britain. *An. Science,* July.

R. DUDLEY EDWARDS. The Work of the Irish Manuscripts Commission. *Studies,* Sept.

J. W. GRANT. Population Shifts in the Maritime Provinces. *Dalhousie Rev.,* Oct.

RICHARD H. HEINDEL. Press Citations in British Documents [on the Origins of the War]. *Journalism Quar.,* Sept.

JOHN W. DAFOE. The Imperial Conference of 1937. *Univ. Toronto Quar.*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

MICHAEL LEWIS. Fresh Light on San Juan de Ulua. *Mariner's Mirror*, July.

The Waterloo Diary of Sir Digby Mackworth. *Army Quar.*, Oct.

HAROLD TEMPERLEY. More Light on the Pact of Osborne, 9 August 1857. *Cam. Hist. Jour.*, V, no. 3.

ERNST CORRELL. Mennonite Immigration into Manitoba: Sources and Documents, 1872, 1873. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, July.

FRANCE

S. B. Clough

The Cult of Antiquity and the French Revolutionaries: A Study in the Development of the Revolutionary Spirit. By HAROLD T. PARKER. (Chicago, University Press, 1937, pp. ix, 215, $2.00.) Twelve years ago Professor Carl Becker lamented the lack of a book showing "how the revolutionary state of mind of the eighteenth century was also nourished on an ideal conception of classical republicanism and Roman virtue". Mr. Harold T. Parker, who has assiduously investigated this question, sets forth the results of his study in this little volume. His aim is "first to trace what members of the French Revolutionary generation, and especially what revolutionaries themselves, thought of antiquity from the high-school to the guillotine; and second, to show how what they thought sometimes affected their state of mind and their actions". The revolutionary generation, he finds, was nourished largely on a few classics emphasizing the glories of republican Rome, its reaction to such an intellectual environment was generally that of adolescents, its first contacts with a workaday world drove it back to the classics for solace, and not until the appearance of the republican movement did its classical heritage assume any importance. Even then it was overshadowed by other influences. With the creation of the republic the classical cult came into its own. During the early Convention and the Terror it flourished, providing the inspiration for educational projects, symbols, public festivals, etc., and it reached its peak in the clash within its own ranks between "Solon" Desmoulins and "Lycurgus" Saint-Just. Thereafter it declined, became a means of face-saving, and ultimately, in the days of the Thermidorian reaction, gave way to a return to eighteenth century realities. Mr. Parker's book is charmingly written and indicates careful thought, meticulous scholarship, wide reading, and a sound appreciation of both classical history and the Revolutionary period. Furthermore, it is well documented and accompanied by an excellent bibliography and a useful index. Its chief weakness is the absence of a concluding chapter to view the results of the author's researches in retrospect. JOHN HALL STEWART.

Cahiers de la Révolution française. No. VI, *Le droit public.* (Paris, Sirey, 1937, pp. 91, 15 fr.) This work, published by the Centre d'études de la Révolution, includes "Les principes financiers de la Révolution" by Joseph Barthélemy and "Le gouvernement parlementaire sous la Convention" by B. Mirkine-Guetzévitch. Professor Barthélemy makes an effort to compare the problems of public finance during the Revolution with those of modern France. He asserts that the principle of direct taxes on real property established by the Constituent Assembly is sound and gave France fiscal peace for 125 years. He laments the present trend toward "personal" taxes and warns against an unbalanced budget that may result in the kind of bankruptcy to which the Directory succumbed. Professor Mirkine-Guetzévitch describes the attempts of Danton to establish parliamentary practices under the Convention.

Les Thermidoriens. By GEORGES LEFEBVRE. (Paris, Armand Colin, 1937, pp. 220, 13 fr.) Was the Revolution "betrayed" by the Thermidorians, as it has long been mandatory to maintain in radical circles? If a betrayal, Professor Lefebvre seems to answer—although neither the word nor the query ever appear in his sober and judicial appraisal—most assuredly not a betrayal of the principles of 1789. He sees the paramount significance of this period not in the struggle of the epigoni, the vendetta against the Jacobins, or the destruction of the revolutionary machinery but in the profound social reaction of which these developments were the symptoms. The reaction did not destroy the forms only; it repudiated the intentions which lay behind them, the intentions of the dictators of 1793-94 to hold capitalistic free enterprise within the bounds of the socially useful and just. In repudiating them the Thermidorians renewed the ties with the individualism of the deputies of the Constituent Assembly. In denying the rule of Virtue and Terror they reverted to the demands which the French bourgeoisie had voiced during the entire eighteenth century. Not without vindictiveness, brutality, and corruption, they triumphantly re-established, for the next hundred years, the regime of economic liberty and conservative, antidemocratic political rule. LEO GERSHOY.

Correspondance de René de Kerallain. Volume III, *10 février 1910-18 juin 1914.* Published by Madame RENÉ DE KERALLAIN, née de Bigault d'Avocourt. (Quimper, Imprimerie Bargain, 1937, pp. 432.) There is no great change in René de Kerallain's list of correspondents during these years except that family letters occupy slightly more space than in the earlier volumes, in part because of the journey to India of his son Jacques. Incidentally, the student of society will be interested by the direct and indirect portraiture of this accomplished young man, who seemed an English or American type to his father during the interval between his army service and his degree in law. The epistolary debates on history and comparative law continue with much the same French, English, and Canadian correspondents, but there is an extremely interesting series of letters to M. Daniel Halévy, which is a model of scholarly discussion of differences. The sharp flavor of the volume is to be drawn from the commentary on the exciting passing scene of these years in France and Europe as made by an alert, witty Breton savant who was also a royalist and who kept up with British and American periodicals. M. Jules Romains might be well advised to envisage such a character among his *Men of Good Will.* J. B. BREBNER.

ARTICLES

HENRY VAN ETTEN. Quakerism in France. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.,* Spring.

GABRIEL LOUIS JARAY. Les principes de la politique américaine de la France sous Henri IV, Richelieu, et Colbert. *Rev. Synthèse,* June.

K. VON RAUMER. Richelieu. *Hist. Zeitsch.,* CLVI, no. 3.

A. MIROT. Lettres du Chevalier de Folard à Nicolas Desmaretz, sur les affaires d'Italie pendant la guerre de la succession d'Espagne. *Rev. Études Hist.,* Apr.

ANDRÉ SAYOUS. L'affaire de Law et les Genevois. *Zeitsch. Schweiz. Gesch.,* Sept.

G. L. JARAY. Champlain. *Rev. Études Hist.,* Apr.

PIERRE BOYÉ. Stanislaus Leszczynski et la cour d'Espagne. *An. Est,* 1937, no. 1.

RAYMOND O. ROCKWOOD. Review Article: Voltaire. *Jour. Mod. Hist.,* Dec.

G. SAUMADE. La Révolution française et l'Ordre international de Malte, 1789-1796: La nationalisation des biens de l'Ordre. *Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Contemp.,* Oct.

F. EVRARD. Le commerce des laines d'Espagne sous le premier Empire. *Rev. Hist. Mod.,* July.

ÉMILE FRANCESCHINI. La Corse sous Napoléon: Le gouvernement du Général Morand. *Rev. Études Nap.,* Nov., 1936.

François Dutacq. L'occupation autrichienne à Lyon en 1815. *Ibid.*

P. Muret. G. Ferrero, historien de Bonaparte. *Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Contemp.*, Oct.

Eliane Feifer. Vergennes et Talleyrand. *Sci. Pol.*, Aug.

Sotiris Agapitidès. Saint Simon et le corporatisme fasciste. *Rev. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, Oct.

F. Ponteil. L'Alsacien T. G. Humann. *Rev. Hist. Mod.*, July.

Mme. M. M. Kahan-Robecq. La crise des subsistances dans le Haut Rhin à la veille de la Rév. de 1848. *Rév. 1848*, Mar.

Morazé. La situation industrielle et financière du Nord de 1857 à 1870. *Bull. Soc. Hist. Mod.*, Oct.

R. A. Winnacker. The Délégation des Gauches: A Successful Attempt at Managing a Parliamentary Coalition. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Dec.

R. Stadelmann. Friedensversuche im ersten Jahre des Weltkrieges. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, Sept.

Pierre Laroque. L'arbitrage obligatoire dans les conflits du travail en France. *Sci. Pol.*, Aug.

R. Besnier. De la loi des XII tables à la législation de l'après-guerre: Quelques observations sur les vicissitudes de la notion romaine de la propriété. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, July.

The Netherlands and Belgium

A. J. Barnouw

The Economic Activities of the Jews of Amsterdam in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. By Herbert I. Bloom. (Williamsport, Pa., Bayard Press, 1937, pp. xviii, 332, $4.00.) In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Amsterdam was one of the leading commercial and intellectual centers of Europe. The mercantilism of that age encouraged every means for augmenting the population and wealth of a commercially minded city and nation. Therefore Jews were welcomed in cities like Amsterdam. In the eighteenth century it developed one of the largest and most important Jewish communities in Europe. Within the city Jews were prominent in Hebrew book publishing, sugar refining, spice trading, tobacco selling, and other occupations. The diamond and jewelry industries were largely in Jewish hands. Numbers of Amsterdam Jews settled in various parts of Europe, the Levant, and the West Indies and thereby fostered Dutch trade. The entire vast field of these Jewish economic activities is the subject of Mr. Bloom's thoroughgoing study. It is based on extensive manuscript material collected in Dutch and American archives and is exhaustive in its use of published documents and literary sources. The author arrives at the conclusion that the Jews did not create the capitalistic spirit of Amsterdam but that they acted upon it. Interest in the credit business and in impersonal capitalistic methods was not specifically Jewish. In a city which was the very embodiment of capitalistic activity, however, the Jewish community, consisting predominantly of businessmen, was undoubtedly an important factor. In order to build up an economic and social history of the Jews of real scientific value we need other detailed and impartial studies for the various countries like this thesis by one of Professor Salo Baron's pupils. Guido Kisch.

Articles

N. Japikse. Nederlandsche Historische Literatuur. *Bijdr. Vaderland. Gesch. Oudh.*, VIII, nos. 3-4.

L. Kooperberg. Bijdragen tot de Erasmus herdenking: De verhouding van Erasmus tot het Oostenrijksche huis. *Rev. Belge Phil. et Hist.*, Jan., 1937.

H. Riemens. De financieele politick onder Koning Willem I. *Gids*, Aug.

L. Couvreur. De eerste Verzekeringscompagnie te Antwerpen (1754-1793?). *Tijdschr. Ec. en Soc.*, July, 1936.

H. A. C. Fabius. De inlichtingendienst van den Generalen Staf: Herinneringen uit de mobilisatiejaren, 1914-1919. *Bijdr. Vaderland. Gesch. Oudh.*, VIII, nos. 3-4.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, HUNGARY

E. N. Anderson

Die Verwaltungsorganisation Nordwestdeutschlands während der Französischen Besatzungszeit, 1811-13. By ALBERT C. SCHWARTING. [Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Gesellschaft zum Studium Niedersachsens e. V.] (Oldenburg i. O., Gerhard Stalling, 1936, pp. 68, 2.70 M.) The scope of this study is broader than the title indicates. The author endeavors to determine the degree of direct and indirect influence exercised by France on the northwest areas of Germany annexed by her on January 1, 1811, and to show especially the effects of the French innovations on the masses. Since previous investigators have scarcely touched the subject, the author has had to base his work on extensive archival research, and the thoroughness of his investigations is manifest by the fact that he has worked in the archives in Aurich, Hamburg, Copenhagen, Lübeck, Oldenburg i. O., Osnabrück, and Paris. He concludes that the extensive French plans for reforms in these German territories made attractive reading but that they were carried out only in part, that in the eyes of the natives they did not improve conditions, and that they aggravated the aversion of the Germans, especially the upper classes, to the French domination. The study enriches decidedly the present knowledge of the reactions of the Germans to the French during the period covered and must be used by anyone dealing with Napoleonic imperialism from either the French or the German angle. Unfortunately, it is dully written, the materials are not so arranged as to make for clarity, and the reference data are incomplete.

München als deutsche Kulturstadt im 19. Jahrhundert. By EUGEN FRANZ. (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1936, pp. ix, 249, 4.80 M.) This is a book for those who know and love Munich by an author who has inherited his feeling for its character and cannot help writing of the old city with the good humor and the kindliness which he has learned from it, who has, moreover, read with enjoyment the volumes listed in the eleven pages of his closely typed bibliography and has sat long hours over a stein of beer and a copy of the *Fliegende Blätter*. Everybody in Munich should be satisfied with the author, for he is satisfied with almost everybody; and Adolf Hitler functions emotionally in the preface and the conclusion.

Die kleindeutsche Partei in Bayern in den Kämpfen um die nationale Einheit, 1863-1871. By THEODOR SCHIEDER. (Munich, C. H. Beck, 1936, pp. v, 301, 11.50 M.) Based on primary sources, this monograph is a reliable and thorough chronological narrative of the political activities of the *kleindeutsch* party in Bavaria from 1863 to 1871, interwoven with biographical sketches of its leaders and illustrated by a large number of quotations taken from speeches, newspapers, and magazine articles. Since many of the problems and factual developments involved have been dealt with before from a similar angle in the monographs of K. A. v. Müller, K. v. Raumer, and H. Ruider, Dr. Schieder's contribution proves to be more of a confirmation than a modification of the customary approach and treatment, which, as the author himself realizes, are now rather out of date. These conventional patterns and measures of value go back to the famous contest between Sybel and Ficker, who rationalized the struggle between Prussia and Austria for supremacy in Germany by relating it to the controversy as to whether the policies of the medieval German emperors should be described and judged from a national or a universal standpoint. From that time to the postwar period the historical interpretation of the German unification movement was overshadowed by the artificial isolation of political, diplomatic, constitu-

tional, and ideological developments without giving due attention to the underlying economic and social forces, and by the inadequate attempt to reduce the bewildering complexity of the German problem to the oversimplified *kleindeutsch-grossdeutsch* antithesis. Confronted with the emergence of the Anschluss question, postwar Austrian historians under the leadership of Srbik have with considerable success paved the way for a better and deeper understanding by developing a more synthetic approach and a more comprehensive and flexible interpretation from a *gesamtdeutsch* point of view. The scientific inadequacy of limiting the unification struggle to the *kleindeutsch-grossdeutsch* antagonism is clearly and conclusively shown by the material published in my *Nationalpolitische Publizistik Deutschlands.* HANS ROSENBERG.

Germany and Morocco before 1905. By FRANCIS TORRANCE WILLIAMSON. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1937, pp. 210, $2.00.) The author of this volume analyzes three phases of German activity with reference to Morocco. In the first place, he makes a valuable contribution to the history of European ideas regarding international relations by showing how the new generation of geographers and explorers arising in Germany after 1871 constructed a body of ideas which seemed to furnish the basis for hopes of great economic advantages to be obtained from the exploitation of Moroccan resources. Secondly, he describes the development of German material interests, chiefly commercial, in Morocco. Finally, he traces the evolution of the policy of the German government towards that country. It would naturally be assumed that these three phases of German activity were closely interrelated. Such, however, is not the conclusion of the author. He writes:

> The hopes which the new generation expressed and the policy which the Imperial Government followed have little connection with each other, nor is any correlation apparent between either of them and the concrete interests which German nationals created in Morocco. The motivation of the German policy . . . must be sought . . . in the body of ideas which surround such concepts as national honor, prestige and power [p. 160].

For this theory, it seems to the reviewer, too little evidence is adduced. Indeed, in the form in which it is stated, it appears to conflict with certain facts presented in the course of the narrative. It is, however, an interesting idea and is worth further investigation, which might throw new light on the psychology of prewar imperialism. The author has examined a great number of printed sources, but he does not seem to have consulted any manuscript material. There is a comprehensive and well-constructed index. The book is thought provoking and well written. F. R. FLOURNOY.

ARTICLES

W. VOGEL. La Hanse, d'après les publications récentes. *Rev. Hist.*, Mar.

WILHELM WISWEDEL. Gabriel Ascherham und die nach ihm benannte Bewegung. I. *Arch. f. Reformationsgesch.*, XXXIV, nos. 1-2.

R. FINK. Das protestantische Kirchenlied des Dreissigjährigen Krieges. *Neue Jahrb. f. Deutsche Wissen.*, 1937, no. 4.

K. BRANDI. Karl V. *Ibid.*

PAULUS VOLK. Abt Leonard Colchon von Seligenstadt, 1625-1653, und sein Briefwechsel. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

MAX BRAUBACH. Kurtrier und die Seemächte während des spanischen Erbfolgekrieges. *Ibid.*

WALTER SCHNEIDER. Die Kirchenpolitik Friedrichs des Grossen. *Hist. Vierteljahrsch.*, XXXI, no. 2.

KARL DRINKLAGE. Daberg, eine Grenzland Siedlung des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Südostdeutsche Forsch.*, II.

J. ROUGE. L'hellénisme à l'époque de Goethe. *Rev. German.*, July.

RICHARD BENZ. Nationalgefühl und Geistigkeit. *Deutsche Rundschau*, Oct.

ALEXANDER SCHNÜTGEN. Johann Heinrich Schmeddings Frühzeit. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

THEODOR HAERING. Der tragische Kant: Versuch einer Ergänzung des herrschenden Kantbildes. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Kulturphilos.*, III, no. 2.

THOMAS MOODY CAMPBELL. Aspects of Nietzsche's Struggle with Philology to 1871. *Ger. Rev.*, Oct.

LUDWIG RASCHDAU. Wie die deutsch-russische "Freundschaft" zu Ende ging: Aus persönlichen Erinnerungen. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Sept.

FRIEDRICH VON BRONSART. Der alte Kaiser und sein Kriegsminister von Bronsart. *Hist. Vierteljahrsch.*, XXXI., no. 2.

W. WIPPERMANN. Carlyle und das neue Deutschland. *Neue Jahrb. f. Deutsche Wissen.*, 1937, no. 4.

GUSTAV GRAF VON LAMBSDORFF. Bemerkungen zum deutsch-russischen Rückversicherungsvertrag. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Oct.

LUDWIG RASCHDAU. Entgegnung an Graf Lambsdorff. *Ibid.*

FRIEDRICH THIMME. Aus dem Nachlass des Fürsten Radolin: Fürst Radolin, Holstein und Friedrich Rosen [cont.]. *Ibid.*, Sept.

KURT WIEDENFELD. Gustav Schmoller und die Volkswirtschaftslehre. *Deutsche Rundschau*, Oct.

R. STADELMANN. Friedensversuche im ersten Jahre des Weltkriegs. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, CLVI, no. 3.

KÄTE NADLER. Idee und Wirklichkeit des Lebens bei C. G. Carus: Ein Beitrag zur Lebensphilosophie der Romantik und der Gegenwart. *Zeitsch. f. Deutsche Kulturphilos.*, III, no. 2.

HANS W. ROSENHAUPT. Heinrich Mann und die Gesellschaft. *Ger. Rev.*, Oct.

HAROLD G. CARLSON. The Heredity Motif in Germanic Prose Fiction. *Ibid.*, July.

HERMANN KOWNATZKI. Die Bedeutung der Sundzoll-Listen nach den Elbinger Pfundzoll-Listen. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

WILHELM MILKE. Die historische Richtung in der Völkerkunde. *Schmollers Jahrb.*, Aug.

EUGEN VON BONOMI. Deutsches Burschenleben im Ofner Bergland. *Südostdeutsche Forsch.*, II.

GÉZA KARSAI-ZURZWEIL. J. R. Bünker und die deutsche Volkskundeforschung. *Ibid.*

HANS FEYN. Stand und Aufgaben der Siedlungsgeographie im Ostbayerischen Grenzgebirge. *Ibid.*

OSWALD REDLICH. Josef I als Thronfolger. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

ELEMÉR MÁLYUSZ. Kaunitz über die Kulturpolitik der Habsburgermonarchie. *Südostdeutsche Forsch.*, II.

C. DE GRUNWALD. Metternich et Napoléon. *Rev. Deux Mondes*, Oct.

La fin d'une ambassade, Metternich à Paris en 1808-1809: Mémoires inédits [cont.]. *Rev. Paris*, Oct.

HEINRICH RITTER VON SRBIK. Der Geheimvertrag Osterreichs und Frankreichs vom 12. Juni 1866. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVII, nos. 2-3.

RICHARD FESTER. Die Friedensoffensiven Czernins. *Berl. Monatsh.*, Aug.

LUDWIG BITTNER. Das österreichisch-ungarische Ministerium des Äussern, seine Geschichte und seine Organisation. *Ibid.*, Oct.

HANS PIRCHEGGER. Das Volkstum der untersteierischen Städte und Märkte. *Südostdeutsche Forsch.*, I.

LEOPOLD SCHMIDT. Volksliedlandschaft Niederösterreich. *Ibid.*, II.

ALFRED MALASCHOFSKY. Die Sprachinsel Deutsch-Proben. *Ibid.*

BERNHARD HANS ZIMMERMANN. Hans Ungnad, Freiherr von Sonneck, als Förderer reformatorischer Bestrebungen bei den Südslaven. *Ibid.*

GOTTFRIED FITTBOGEN. Stammeslieder deutscher Volksgruppen im Südosten. *Ibid.*, I.

VALERIN L. BOLOGNA. Deutsche Einflüsse auf die Entwicklung der rümanischen Medizin. *Ibid.*

G. Z. Petrescu. Streben und Leistungen deutscher Aerzte in den rümanischen Ländern. *Ibid.*, II.

J. C. Hesse. National Minorities in Europe: VII, The Germans in Poland. *Slav. Rev.*, July.

Arno Mehlan. Historischer Überblick über die deutsch-bulgarischen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen. *Schmollers Jahrb.*, Aug.

Fritz Valjavec. Wege und Wandlungen deutscher Südostforschung. *Südostdeutsche Forsch.*, I.

Hans Petri. Vorbemerkungen zu einer Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation in den Donaufürstentümern. *Ibid.*, II.

Aegidius Faulstich. Deutsche und Nichtdeutsche in der schwäbischen Türkei. *Ibid.*, I.

Heinrich Kunnert. Bibliographie zur Landes- und Volkskunde des Burgenlandes. *Ibid.*

Anna Loschdorfer. Dorfgemeinschaften und Volksliedpflege im Bakonyerwald. *Ibid.*

Ernst Löger. Zur Geschichte des burgenländischen Schulwesens. *Ibid.*

Johann Weidlein. Die volklichen Verhältnisse in der schwäbischen Türkei im 18. Jahrhundert. *Ibid.*

Hedwig Schwind. Jakob Bleyers Eintritt in den Kampf für das ungarländische Deutschtum. *Ibid.*

Ernst Görlich. Ungarn im Blickfeld der österreichischen Mitteleuropa-Idee. *Ibid.*, II.

Andreas Babics. Die ersten deutschen Ansiedler Fünfkirchens nach der türkischen Herrschaft. *Ibid.*

Johann Weidlein. Die Mundarten der deutschen Streusiedlungen in Ostungarn. *Ibid.*

Wilhelm Wostry. Die Heimatländer der Sudetendeutschen zwischen Ost und West [cont.]. *Mitteil. Vereins f. Gesch. Deutschen in Böhmen*, May.

N. J. Szenczi. East and West in Hungarian Literature. *Slav. Rev.*, July.

Werner Stark. Niedergang und Ende des landwirtschaftlichen Grossbetriebs in den böhmischen Ländern. *Jahrb. f. Nationalök. u. Statist.*, Oct.

Italy

Gaudens Megaro

Articles

B. Croce. La "tradizione italiana". *Critica*, Sept.

Id. Un dialogo tra Giulia Gonzaga e Giovanni di Valdes. *Ibid.*

Forbin. Le Cardinal de Forbin-Janson à Rome: L'affaire des Bulles, 1691-1693 [cont.]. *Rev. Hist. Dipl.*, Jan.

Niccolò Rodolico. Inizî del Risorgimento italiano. *N. Antol.*, Sept. 1.

Gilbert J. Garraghan. John Anthony Grassi, S. J., 1775-1849. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Antonio Lucarelli. La questione del Mediterraneo e l'occupazione francese della Puglia all'inizio del secolo XIX. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, June.

Italo Lunelli. Repertori dei documenti per la storia del Risorgimento. *Ibid.*, July.

Guido Porzio. Studi albertini e alterazioni programmatiche nella storia del Risorgimento. *N. Riv. Stor.*, May.

Pietro Gismondi. Dottrina e politica ecclesiastica di Bettino Ricasoli [cont.]. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, July.

Giorgio Bardanzellu. Giuseppe Macherione, Poeta del Risorgimento e profeta della nuova Italia. *Ibid.*, June.

Luigi Ferrara Mirenzi. Due vescovi senatori del regno. *Ibid.*, May.

Franco Valsecchi. La mediazione europea e la definizione dell'aggressore alla vigilia della guerra del 1859 [cont.]. *Ibid.*, June.

Salvatore Sibilia. Il generale Bonelli [cont.]. *Ibid.*, July.

Edmondo Cione. Uno storico tacitista del ottocento, Michele Farnerari. *N. Riv. Stor.*, May.

Luigi Salvatorelli. La Triplice Alleanza [cont.]. *Rass. Pol. Internaz.*, May.

Carlo Zaghi. La marcia su Adua del generale Orero. *Ibid.*, Mar.

Maffio Maffii. Corradini e il "Regno". *Politica*, Aug.

Augusto Torre. La preparazione diplomatica dell'impresa libica [cont.]. *Rass. Pol. Internaz.*, June.

Cesare Vidal. Gli studi francesi sul Risorgimento: L'Italia odierna. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, May.

HAROLD D. LASSWELL and RENZO SERENO. Governmental and Party Leaders in Fascist Italy. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Oct.

MAX ASCOLI. Education in Fascist Italy. *Social Research*, Sept.

GAETANO SALVEMINI. The Teachers' Oath in Italy. *Harvard Educational Rev.*, Oct.

RAFFAELE DI LAURO. Somalia italiana e regime fascista. *Rass. Ital.*, Aug.

E. W. POLSON NEWMAN. Britain and Italy. *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

VINCENZO CANNAVIELLO, ed. Memoria inedita sulla preparazione dei moti costituzionali del 1820 in Avellino. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, May.

ROBERTO JACQUIN. Sei lettere inedite del P. Taparelli D'Azeglio. *Rass. Ital.*, Sept.

LEONARDO MORDINI. La legione umanitaria per la difesa della Sicilia ne' suoi rapporti colle condizioni politiche d'Italia esterne ed enterne: Scritto inedito di Paolo Fabrizi. *Rass. Stor. Risorgimento*, July.

ALBERTO M. GHISALBERTI. Un diario d'esilio di Giuseppe Galletti. *Ibid.*, June.

ALESSANDRO GUICCIOLI. Diario del 1883, 1884, 1885 [cont.]. *N. Antol.*, Sept. 1-Oct. 16.

GIACOMO DE MARTINO. Ricordi di carriera: La mia missione a Costantinopoli per la guerra di Libia. *Rass. Pol. Internaz.*, Apr.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

Hans Kohn

Heimat und Volk: Forschungsbeiträge zur Sudetendeutschen Geschichte. Festschrift für Universitätsprofessor Dr. Wilhelm Wostry. Edited by ANTON ERNSTBERGER. (Brünn, Rohrer, 1937, pp. 601, Kc. 230.) This bulky volume contains twenty-three articles by leading German historians in Czechoslovakia. Of special interest are the biography of Johann Nysius, a clergyman of the period of the Counter Reformation, contributed by the editor, and an article on the economic and social situation of Brünn, the capital of Moravia, during the revolutionary years of 1848-49 by Erich Nachtmann. The introductory article by Hans Prokert, "Probleme der Geschichtsbetrachtung in den Sudetendeutschen Ländern", outlines the position of the German historians in Czechoslovakia with reference to the formation and the importance of the German element in Bohemia and Moravia.

Der Sinn der tschechischen Geschichte. By JOSEF PEKAŘ. (Brünn, Rohrer, 1937, pp. 68, Kc. 12.) This is a translation of the writings of the famous Czech historian, who died last year, on the philosophy of Czech history. His remarks against the conception of Czech history as proposed by Palacký and Masaryk are to a certain degree polemical. The book contains an introduction by Josef Pfitzner, the historian of the German University in Prague.

Jihočeský Sborník Historický. Vol. X. (Southern Bohemian Society for the Preservation of Hussite Memorials in Tabor, 1937.) These yearbooks have been published regularly since 1928 and contain remarkably rich documentation on the Hussite period and especially on the history of the city of Tabor. One of the chief contributors is F. M. Bartoš.

Nové příspěvky k dějinám Habánov na Slovensku. By FRANTIŠEK KRAUS. (Bratislava, Slovenská Grafie, 1937, pp. 155.) The present small book is the first systematic treatise dealing with the Anabaptist sect of the sixteenth century which settled in two places in Slovakia and also in Nikolsburg in Moravia. The followers of this sect formed communistic communities on a religious basis in small circles. The followers of the Haban sect later joined the Mennonites.

Politické Dějiny Československého Národa od R. 1848 Až do dnešní doby. Vol. IV, *1914-1918.* By ZDENĚK TOBOLKA. (Prague, Kompas, 1937, pp. 410, Kc. 45.) Of his

"Political History of the Czechoslovak Nation from the Year 1848 to the Present Time" Dr. Tobolka has published four volumes. The first deals with the years 1848-1859, the second carries us from 1860 to 1879, the third consists of two parts, of which the first discusses the hegemony of the Old Czech party, 1879-1891, the second, the tendencies and currents of the years from 1891 to 1914. The present volume deals with the war period. It is interesting to know that the author attributes the greatest merit for the formation of Czechoslovakia and for its diplomatic foundation to Dr. Eduard Beneš. The volumes are well illustrated but contain no references, bibliographies, or indexes.

Dějiny Maffie. By MILADA PAULOVA. Volume I. (Prague, Československá Grafická Unie, 1937, pp. 670, Kc. 85.) Mme. Paulova, professor of history at the Czech University of Prague, presents here the first volume of what promises to be an authoritative history of the Czech and Yugoslav movements during the World War. It deals with the period from the outbreak of the World War to the autumn of 1915, when Dr. Beneš arrived in Switzerland. The second volume will deal with the history from 1915 to May 30, 1917, the third and last volume will bring the narrative down to October 28, 1918. The book is based throughout on original research, on firsthand documents, and on reports and information from the persons who participated in the Czech and Yugoslav movements during the war. It is documented and contains an index and twenty-six illustrations.

Dr. Edvard Beneš: Sein Leben. By JAROSLAV PAPOUŠEK. (Prague, Orbis, 1937, pp. 305.) The author is one of the younger Czech historians. He has written the biography of President Beneš as a historian and as a political scientist. The book does not deal with the man Beneš but with the ideas and activities of the statesman. It will therefore be of great value to every student of postwar international relations. It contains an important appendix of documents from the Little Entente agreement of August 14, 1920, to the treaty between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union of May 16, 1935. There is a good index and a bibliography of the more important pamphlets and books by Dr. Beneš.

Dalmacija i Venecija na preliminarima u Leobenu i za miru u Campo-Formiu. By STJEPAN ANTOLIJAK. (Zagreb, 1936, pp. 132.) A detailed account, based upon documents in the archives of Vienna, of how Dalmatia and Venetia came under Austrian control in the preliminary treaty of Leoben and the peace treaty of Campo-Formio.

Sarajevo u doba okupacije Bosne, 1878. By HAMDIJA KREŠEVLJAKOVIĆ. (Sarajevo, Muslimanska Svijest, 1937, pp. 127, Din. 30.) The Mohammedan Yugoslav historian describes the last days of the Turkish rule in Bosnia, the occupation of Sarajevo by Austria, and the subsequent events. There are detailed biographies of the leaders of the insurrection who were executed by the Austrians. The Austrian proclamation to the populations of Bosnia and Herzegovina is reprinted. Much of the narrative is based upon the reports of the few still existing survivors of those days.

Borba za nezavisimost Balkana. By VLADIMIR ČOROVIĆ. (Belgrade, Balkanski Institut, 1937, pp. 207, Din. 20.) In this book the author, professor of history at the University of Belgrade, sketches the history of the Balkan peoples from the immigration of the Slavs to the peninsula down to the present day. The history of the last one hundred years is dealt with in greater detail from the Serbian point of view. The author maintains the necessity of a close co-operation of the Balkan peoples in the interest of their national independence.

ARTICLES

KAMIL KROFTA. Josef Pekař, 1870-1937. *Prager Rundschau,* 1937, no. 2.

JOSEPH ŠUSTA. Histoire de Tchécoslovaquie, 1931-1935 [cont.]. *Rev. Hist., Bull. Crit.,* Apr.

WILHELM WOSTRY. Die Heimatländer der Sudetendeutschen zwischen Ost und West. *Zeitsch. f. Sudetendeutsche Gesch.,* I, no. 1.

HEINZ ZATSCHEK. Volksgeschichtliche Aufgaben für die ältere Sudetendeutsche Geschichte. *Ibid.*

JOSEF DOBIÁŠ. Několik problémů z nejstarších dějin našeho území [some problems of the ancient history of our territory]: I, Boiohaemum a Markomani. *Český Časopis Historický,* 1937, no. 2.

VÁCLAV LIVA. Národnostní poměry v Praze za třicetileté války [nationality problems in Prague during the Thirty Years' War]. *Ibid.*

FRANTIŠEK KUTNAR. Reakce státu v Čechách na Velkou revoluci francouzskou [governmental reaction in Bohemia to the French Revolution]. *Ibid.*

FLORIO BANFI. Panegirico di Giovanni Michele Naganio su Uladislao II Re di Boemia ed Ungharia. *Europa Orientale,* XVII, nos. 7-8.

MIROSLAV VANINO. Le P. Barthélemy Kašić, S. I., écrivain croate, 1575-1650: Étude bio-bibliographique. *Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu,* July.

RUSSIA

Avrahm Yarmolinsky

Ocherki drevnēishei istorii khazar [studies in the oldest history of the Khazars]. By M. J. ARTAMONOV. (Leningrad, Gosizdat, 1936, pp. 138, 5 r.) This book contains three studies in the historical geography and early political history of the steppe of Eastern Europe. The first essay deals with the identity of the W-n-n-th-r people mentioned in King Joseph's letter to Ibn Shaprut. The second discusses the relation between the Khazars and the Turks. The third, entitled "The Origin of Khazars", has to do with the early history of that people.

ARTICLES

ADAM GLUSHKOVSKI. Moskva v 1812 godu [Moscow in 1812: excerpts from memoirs]. *Krasnyĭ arkhiv,* 1937, no. 4.

S. LAPITZKAYA. Zavoyevaniye i kolonizatziya Kryma tzarizmom [conquest and colonization of the Crimea by czarism]. *Istoricheski zhurnal,* 1937, no. 7.

A. ZOLOTAREV. Iz istorii narodov Amura [sketch of the history of the peoples of the Amur]. *Ibid.*

E. LUTZKI. Krest'yanskoye vosstaniye v Tambovskoĭ gubeĭnii v sentyabre 1917 g. [a peasant uprising in the province of Tambov in 1917]. *Ibid.,* no. 9.

MARIA PAVLICOWA. O formacjach kozackich w czasie wojny krymskiej [Cossacks in the Crimean war]. *Kwartalnik historiczny,* 1936, nos. 1, 4.

R. FLENLEY. The Russian Revolution, 1917-1937. *Toronto Quar.,* Oct.

DOCUMENTS

A. M. BIZE, ed. Popytki osvoyeniya prirodnykh bogatstv Osetii v XVIII stoletii [mining in the Northern Caucasus, 18th century]. *Krasnyĭ arkhiv,* 1937, no. 4.

E. KATZMAN, ed. Russki dobrovoletz v ryadakh ispanskikh insurgentov v 1830 g. [a Russian volunteer in the Spanish insurrection in 1830]. *Ibid.*

M. L. LUR'YE, ed. Pod'yom rabochevo dvizheniya pered pervoĭ imperialisticheskoĭ voĭnoĭ [the labor movement before the World War]. *Ibid.,* no. 3.

M. I. GUBEL'MAN, ed. Partizanskoye dvizheniye v Primor'ye [a partisan movement in the Maritime province, 1919-22]. *Ibid.*

Id., ed. Ob okkupatzii yaponskimi voĭskami Severnovo Sakhalina v 1920-25 gg. [occupation of Northern Sakhalin by Japanese armies in 1920-25]. *Ibid.*

I. MARTYNOV, ed. K istorii grazhdanskoi voiny v Yakutii v 1922 g. [civil war in Yakutia in 1922]. *Ibid.*

FAR EASTERN HISTORY

C. H. Peake

The Struggle for the Pacific. By GREGORY BIENSTOCK. (New York, Macmillan, 1937, pp. 299, $4.00.) In a volume of three chapters Mr. Bienstock has attempted to survey the peopling of the Pacific area, the rivalries which have arisen there, and the strategy of major wars which might break out. For painting such an expansive canvas one would expect the artist to use broad sweeps of his brush and a minimum of detail. But in this instance the result has been a cyclorama in which, here and there amid the hazy background, a few episodes are depicted with some minuteness. And because the background has been so vaguely suggested the details are shockingly inaccurate. The adverb has been used with intent because, on first examination, the extensive bibliography, with titles in several western languages, and the 216 notes at the end of the chapters give the appearance of scholarship. But if the German and Russian authorities have been selected as casually as the British and American, the result might have been predicted in advance. The pages are packed with information of one kind or another, but the whole mass of material has been so badly digested and so many errors and inconsistencies occur that doubt must be cast upon the less verifiable matters. Let us look at the way Mr. Bienstock handles statistics. We read that in Manchuria in 1932 there were 600,000 Japanese, half of them probably soldiers (pp. 72, 73), and in 1931 there were 232,753 (p. 74). Anyone who has studied Manchurian statistics knows that the twice-repeated first statement is absurd. The pages are peppered with inaccuracies, which cannot be specified here for lack of space. Civilians are given military titles, statesmen are ascribed to cabinets in which they did not serve, exchanges of notes are called "conventions", and articles which exist only in the imagination of the author are inserted in treaties. Naturally, conclusions based on such premises can hardly be accepted without qualification. PAYSON J. TREAT.

History of Japanese Education and Present Educational System. By HUGH LE. KEENLEYSIDE and A. F. THOMAS. (Tokyo, Hokuseido Press, 1937, pp. xiii, 365, $4.00.) Dr. Keenleyside, formerly of the Canadian Legation, Tokyo, and Mr. Thomas, professor in the University of Literature and Science in Tokyo, have written a competent if not critical account of education in Japan, past and present, based in part on Japanese sources. The emphasis is on educational developments since the Meiji Restoration of 1868. Over half the book deals in detail with the present educational system. The appendix contains the official Japanese chronology as taught in the schools, which gives the date of the beginning of the reign of the first emperor, Jimmu Tenno, as being 660 B.C., whereas critical Japanese scholarship has brought that date down to 25 B.C., with a decreasing discrepancy in the official chronology down to the latter half of the sixth century, when accurate dating begins.

Japanese Tales of All Ages. By OMORI HARRIS. (Tokyo, Hokuseido, 1937, pp. viii, 347, $2.00.) Mr. Harris has selected the most famous Japanese tales concerning the mythological gods, warriors, priests, artists, and reformers to present the background upon which Japanese children form their ideas of heroism. There are enough historical data connected with many of these to make them not only pleasant reading but colorful pictures of feudalistic Japan. HUGH BORTON.

When China Unites. By HARRY GANNES. (New York, Knopf, 1937, pp. xiii, 293, $2.50.) This gives a journalistic account of developments in China since 1911,

culminating in the current national unity brought about largely by Japanese aggression. The usual large number of factual and typographical errors are present in this work as in most works on the Far East written by those whose knowledge of the field is superficially journalistic and published by houses the staffs of which are devoid of editors with adequate training in Far Eastern languages and history.

ARTICLES

PAUL RATCHNEWSKY. Un Code des Yuan. *Bibliothèque Institut Hautes Études Chinoises*, IV.

EDUARD ERKES. Ist die Hsia-Dynastie Geschichtlich? *T'oung Pao*, XXXIII, no. 2.

OWEN LATTIMORE. Origins of the Great Wall of China: A Frontier Concept in Theory and Practice. *Geograph. Rev.*, Oct.

DAVID C. GRAHAM. An Excavation at Suifu. *Jour. West China Border Research Soc.*, VIII.

CH'EN, CH'IEN-CHÜN. T'ung-Chien Min-tsu Szu-hsiang Li-t'se [evidences of racial thought in the T'ung-Chien, cont.]. *Hsüeh-shu Shih-chieh*, Apr.

OLIVER H. BEDFORD. Kuan Yü, China's God of War. *China Jour.*, Sept.

HERMANN BOHNER. Shōtoku Taishi: I, Jōgū-Shōtoku-Hōō-Tei-Setsu; II, Jōgū-Kwōtaishi-Bosatsu-Den. *Deutsche Gesellschaft f. Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens*, 1936.

J. B. SNELLEN. Shoku Nihongi IV-VI [Chronicles of Japan, cont.]. *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, June.

A. C. MOULE. Marco Polo's Description of Quinsai. *T'oung Pao*, XXXIII, no. 2.

CHEN, CHU-T'UNG. Yüan-tai Chung-hua Min-tsu Hai-wai Fa-chan K'ao [research on Chinese emigration to the South Seas in the Yuan dynasty, concl.]. *Chi-nan Hsüeh-pao*, June.

OKUNO, TAKAHIRO. Tonomoryō Kyō oyobi Negike Shoryō to no Kenkyū [studies of the domains of the Bureau of Imperial Palace Equipment and the Shintō family, Negi, from the twelfth to the late sixteenth centuries, cont.]. *Kokugakuin Zasshi*, Jan., 1937.

DAVID C. GRAHAM. Historic Notes on the P'O Jen—The Last Group of the Pre-Chinese Thai People to remain in Szechuan. *Jour. West China Border Research Soc.*, VIII.

WALTER FUCHS. The Chinese Jews of K'aifengfu. *T'ien Hsia Monthly*, Aug.

KUWABARA, SABURO. Akechi Mitsuhide no Ichimen [one aspect of the life of Mitsuhide Akechi, 1526-1582]. *Kokugakuin Zasshi*, Apr.

PASQUALE M. D'ELIA. Padre Matteo Ricci e la conoscenza geografica della Cina. *N. Antol.*, Oct. 16.

Id. Due amici del P. Matteo Ricci, S. I., ridotti all'unità. *Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu*, July.

A. L. SADLER. The Naval Campaign in the Korean War of Hideyoshi, 1592-1598. *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, June.

SRI RAM SHARMA. Akbar's Religious Policy. *Indian Hist. Quar.*, June.

W. J. M. BUCH. La Compagnie des Indes néerlandaises, et l'Indochine [cont.]. *Bull. École Fr. Extrême-Orient*, XXXVI.

CHAO, CH'ÜAN-CH'ENG. Shih-pa-shih Chi Lü-sung I-lao-ko Hang-ch'uan Lai Hua Chi [an account of the voyage of the ship "I Lao Ko" from Manila to China in the 18th century]. *Yü Kung*, Feb.

HENRI BERNARD. Chu Hsi's Philosophy and its Interpretation by Leibniz. *T'ien Hsia Monthly*, Aug.

SHIO SAKANISHI. Prohibition of Import of Certain Chinese Books and the Policy of the Edo Government. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, Sept.

N. SKENE SMITH, ed. Materials on Japanese Social and Economic History. *Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan*, June.

NISHIDA, NAGAO. Kikkawa Shintō no Dōtō ni tsuite [studies of the origin and lineage of the Kikkawa school of Shintoism founded by the Kikkawa family, cont.]. *Kokugakuin Zasshi*, Jan., 1937.

CHIA, I-CHÜN. Ch'ing-tai Wen-tzu-yü K'ao-lüeh [research on the literary inquisition during the Ch'ing dynasty]. *Chung-Fa Ta-hsüeh Yüeh-k'an*, Mar.

WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL. Remarks on the Canton Trade and the Manner of doing Business. *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, Oct.

H. HAMMITZSCH. Hirata Atsutane. *Deutsche Gesellschaft f. Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens*, 1936.

FUJIMURA, SAKU. Haga Sensei to Meiji Jidai no Kokubungaku Kenkyū [studies on the influence of Yaichi Haga on Japanese literature of the Meiji period, 1867-1912]. *Kokugakuin Zasshi*, Mar.

C. Y. T'ANG. T'ang Wen-Chih, Statesman and Educator. *T'ien Hsia Monthly*, Aug.

ROBERT T. POLLARD. Intangibles in Japanese Foreign Policy. *Amerasia*, Nov.

GERARD M. FRITERS. The Prelude to Outer Mongolian Independence [cont.]. *Pacific Affairs*, June.

JOHN K. FAIRBANK. The Mechanics of Imperialism in China. *Amerasia*, Sept.

WILLIAM C. JOHNSTONE. The Status of Foreign Concessions and Settlements in the Treaty Ports of China. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Oct.

UNITED STATES HISTORY

E. C. Burnett

GENERAL

Memorial: Herman Vandenburg Ames, Late Professor of American Constitutional History, University of Pennsylvania. Edited by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY and ROY F. NICHOLS. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1936, pp. vii, 31, $1.00.) This contains addresses delivered at the memorial meeting for Dr. Ames held at the University of Pennsylvania on May 7, 1935.

The Voyages of John and Sebastian Cabot. By J. A. WILLIAMSON. [Historical Association Pamphlet, No. 106.] (London, G. Bell, 1937, pp. 19, 1*s*.) A review of the Cabot question by the foremost authority on the subject.

Public Funds for Church and Private Schools. By RICHARD J. GABEL. (Washington, Catholic University of America, 1937, pp. xiv, 858, $3.50.) The author states that his purpose is "to trace the history of public aid for private schools and for religious education from colonial days to the present time, and to present some of the causes that have brought about the reversal of the original American policy".

The Making of the Constitution. By CHARLES WARREN. [New edition.] (Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1937, pp. ix, 832, $3.75.) A republication of a work which first appeared in 1928.

Aaron Burr in Literature. By SAMUEL H. WANDELL. Introduction by Walter F. McCaleb. (New York, Barnes and Noble, 1936, pp. xx, 302, $4.50.) English publishers, who can produce more cheaply than Americans and thus can risk the printing of bibliographies, offer through their American agents a curiously valuable volume on books, articles, and pamphlets that have something to do with Aaron Burr. Its compiler and editor, Mr. Samuel Wandell, is known as the greatest accumulator of Burr material, and his new book represents the gleaning of a lifetime; one does not harvest book titles, one has to glean them. It is incidentally a biographical and critical encyclopedia of Burr's contemporaries who had any relation to him and of a large proportion of the host of authors whose references to Burr are mentioned. These estimates and the plentiful quotations make it actually a readable book, especially for short sessions, though it is mainly intended as a work of reference. Works, plays, and poems are listed and criticized, as well as historical and controversial writings. Even remotely relevant

books are treated—Alice Morse Earle's, for instance—because they deal with Burr's times. The book should be in every considerable historical library provided the person in charge has some idea of what is in it. DIXON RYAN FOX.

General John T. Wilder, Commander of the Lightning Brigade. By SAMUEL C. WILLIAMS. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press; Johnson City, Watauga Press, 1936, pp. viii, 105, $1.50.) This is the life story, compactly told, of a man who earned renown as a commander on the Union side in the Civil War and afterward distinguished himself for industrial leadership in the South, winning the high regard of the very people against whom he had zealously fought. Several appendixes help to document important phases of General Wilder's career.

American Prisons: A Study in American Social History prior to 1915. By BLAKE MCKELVEY. [The University of Chicago Social Service Series.] (Chicago, University Press, 1936, pp. xiv, 242, $3.00.) This is a thoughtful and well-written attempt to relate the history of the development of the American prison system to the changing forces in American life. The author is to be congratulated not merely for drawing together the threads of the development of the American penal system in the different states but also for relating the types of penal institutions to the sectional variations in the social and political pattern. The book tells the story of our varied prison reform movements and of the changing attitudes towards problems of prison administration that arose out of them. Running through the volume is the story of the development of the Auburn system and the gradual breaking away from it. The changes in architectural forms as well as the changes in internal discipline, the gradual breaking down of solitary systems, and the introduction of recreation and education into the prisons are noted. The study includes the development of reformatories, women's prisons, prison farms, road work, probation, parole, etc. Upon these changes in method the author brings to bear the changes in attitude towards the criminal and the new ideas about human nature that have affected notions of criminal causation. Changing economic conditions are correlated with the problems of prison labor, the attack upon the contract system, the substitution of "State Use", and the plantation systems in the South connected with Southern conditions. This is an excellent introduction to the history of the American penal system, though someday, when satisfactory state penal histories have been published, it will have to be rewritten and enlarged. As it stands it is a valuable contribution to American social history. FRANK TANNENBAUM.

Twenty Years as Military Attaché. By Colonel T. BENTLEY MOTT. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1937, pp. 342. $3.50.) A charming book of personal memoirs with stress on the social side; the discussion of military personalities in the World War is interesting.

German-Americans in the World War, with Special Emphasis on Ohio's German-Language Press. By CARL WITTKE. [Ohio Historical Collections.] (Columbus, Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1936, pp. xi, 223, $2.00.) This is a scholarly and valuable study in a field which obviously calls for a wider and more dispassionate knowledge than has hitherto been available. Its scope, though avowedly not comprehensive, is wider than its subtitle modestly implies. A large minority of its 866 references are to papers outside Ohio—mostly from the Middle West but with a considerable sprinkling from the East. Furthermore the Ohio German-language papers themselves, as Dr. Wittke states in his preface, "quoted extensively from German-language papers in all parts of the United States", so that we have here a fairly comprehensive record of the attitude of

such papers in the war years. How largely these papers reflected the sentiments of German-Americans in general, who can say? Dr. Wittke does not profess to know. But he assumes, rather naturally, that they did so in very large measure. At least they indicate a point of view not nearly so taboo since the postwar revelations. Scholars interested in the field should not overlook this book. It was written for them and not for the general reader. ALEX MATHEWS ARNETT.

Evil Results of Mid-Term Congressional Elections and a Suggested Remedy. By PEARL OLIVE PONSFORD. (Los Angeles, University of Southern California Press, 1937, pp. 78, 75 cents.) As introductory to a proposal for remedying what she regards as a major evil of our constitutional system, the author traces the history of mid-term congressional elections from 1840 to the present.

The United States among the Nations. Lectures arranged by the University of California Committee on International Relations. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1937, pp. viii, 184, $1.50.) The following lectures on American foreign policy, given at the University of California in 1936, have been published in book form: "From Washington to Roosevelt: Basic Factors and Traditions in American Foreign Policy" by Eugene I. McCormac, "Pan America" by Herbert I. Priestley, "The United States and Europe: Isolation or Coöperation?" by Robert J. Kerner, "The United States in World Trade" by Henry F. Grady, "Military Policy and National Security" by David P. Barrows, "The Policy of the United States in the Pacific and the Far East" by Chester H. Rowell, "The Two Roads: Isolation or Collective Security" by Frank M. Russell.

ARTICLES

HENRY J. CADBURY. Notes on William Penn's Letters to Holland. *Quakeriana Notes,* Spring.

Notes and Queries. [George Simpson Eddy's ideas on the need for further study of Benjamin Franklin]. *Colophon,* Autumn.

LEWIS H. BOLANDER. The Frigate *Alliance,* the Favorite Ship of the American Revolution. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.,* Sept.

CHARLES FAWCETT. The Striped Flag of the East India Company, and its Connexion with the American "Stars and Stripes". *Mariner's Mirror,* Oct.

BESS FURMAN. Signed, Sealed—and Forgotten: The Story of a Premier Promoter of the Constitution. *D. A. R. Mag.,* Nov.

RUTH SPEICHER. The Federal Constitution as viewed by the Newspapers of 1787. *Social Stud.,* Oct.

THOMAS H. LE DUC. Connecticut and the First Ten Amendments to the Federal Constitution. *Senate Doc.,* 75 Cong., 1 sess., no. 96.

JAMES O. WETTEREAU. New Light on the First Bank of the United States. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.,* July.

JOSEPHINE MAYER and ROBERT A. EAST. The Settlement of Alexander Hamilton's Debts: A Footnote to History. *New York Hist.,* Oct.

EDWIN G. CONKLIN. The American Philosophical Society and the Founders of our Government. *Pennsylvania Hist.,* Oct.

C. H. VAN DUZER. English Liberal Thought in Early United States History. *Ibid.*

JOSEPH B. CODE, ed. A Selected Bibliography of the Religious Orders and Congregations of Women founded within the Present Boundaries of the United States, 1727-1850. *Cath. Hist. Rev.,* Oct.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN. John Anthony Grassi, S. J., 1775-1849. *Ibid.*

HOWARD C. RICE. James Swan, Agent of the French Republic, 1794-1796. *New Eng. Quar.,* Sept.

LEE MERIWETHER. Meriwether Lewis: His Work, and his Place in American History. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.,* Oct.

ELWYN BURNS ROBINSON. The Dynamics of American Journalism from 1787 to 1865. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

WILBUR E. APGAR. William H. Allen and the Chesapeake-Leonard Affair. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Aug.

R. R. STENBERG. Andrew Jackson and the Erving Affidavit. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

CLAUDE SCHAEFFER. The First Jesuit Mission to the Flathead, 1840-1850: A Study in Culture Conflicts. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, July.

FRANK E. ROSS. American Adventures in the Early Marine Fur Trade with China. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, July.

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL. Lincoln and Fort Sumter. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

HARRY E. PRATT. Simon Cameron's Fight for a Place in Lincoln's Cabinet. *Bull. Abraham Lincoln Assoc.*, Sept.

HARRY VON KOLNITZ. The Confederate Submarine. *U. S. Naval Inst. Proc.*, Oct.

EARLE D. ROSS. Oberholtzer's History of the United States since the Civil War. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

REINHARD H. LUTHIN. The Sale of Alaska. *Slavonic Rev.*, July.

O. V. WELLS. The Depression of 1873-1879. *Agricultural Hist.*, July.

JOSEPH SCHAFER. Peopling the Middle West. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, Sept.

Id. Concerning the Frontier as Safety Valve. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.

Id. Was the West a Safety Valve for Labor? *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

EVERETT E. EDWARDS. Middle Western Agricultural History as a Field of Research. *Ibid.*

MAX L. SHIPLEY. The Background and Legal Aspects of the Pendleton Plan. *Ibid.*

SELIG ADLER. The Congressional Election of 1918. *South Atlantic Quar.*, Oct.

BASHFORD DEAN. On American Polearms, especially those in the Metropolitan Museum. *Jour. Am. Mil. Hist. Foundation*, Fall.

MALCOLM R. EISELIN. Dare we call a Federal Convention? *North Am. Rev.*, Autumn.

JOHN F. G. STOKES. Dune Sepulture, Battle Mortality, and Kamehameha's Alleged Defeat on Kauai. *Annual Rep. Hawaiian Hist. Soc.*, 1936.

HUC-M. LUQUIENS. Kamehameha's Portrait. *Ibid.*

DOCUMENTS

JOHN W. HARPSTER, ed. Major William Darlington's Diary of Service in the War of 1812. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

EDWARD H. TATUM, JR. and MARION TINLING. Letters of William Henry Allen, 1800-1813 [cont.]. *Huntington Library Quar.*, Oct.

P. L. RAINWATER, ed. Excerpts from Fulkerson's "Recollections of the War between the States." *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Dec.

JAMES A. PADGETT, ed. The Letters of Judah Philip Benjamin to Ambrose Dudley Mann, Minister of the Confederacy to Belgium and Special Commissioner to the Vatican, together with the Correspondence with the Pope. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, July.

ROSSER H. TAYLOR, ed. Boyce-Hammond Correspondence. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

Captain Nathaniel Lord Thompson of Kennebunk, Maine, and the Ships he Built, 1811-1889. By MARGARET J. THOMPSON. [Penobscot Marine Museum.] (Boston, Lauriat, 1937, pp. xix, 140, $3.50.) This book is worth reading: Miss Thompson's biography of her father, which is all too short; the old captain's autobiography, which is the epitome of terseness; a fleeting glimpse of the old shipyards and "Kennebunk lock"; finally biographies of thirty-eight ships, many of them famous ones. We get a picture of a man of intense energy, a seaman, shipmaster, shipowner, and shipbuilder, who had faith enough in his craftsmanship to take an ownership interest in the ships he built and did not hesitate to sail the ships he owned. If we could wish for anything further it would be that Miss Thompson had let her memories run away with her a little more. We welcome the

Penobscot Marine Museum to the group of societies which are preserving records of a glorious past. Lincoln Colcord's introduction presents their point of view excellently. JAMES DUNCAN PHILLIPS.

A Brief Description of New-York. By DANIEL DENTON. With a Bibliographical Note by VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1937, pp. 21, $1.00.) The Facsimile Text Society has reproduced this work, which was first published in 1670. It was the "first separate work in English relating to the province of New York".

Pressure Politics in New York: A Study of Group Representation before the Legislature. By BELLE ZELLER. (New York, Prentice-Hall, 1937, pp. xi, $3.00.) Every literate person in America must be aware by now that organized special interest groups exert pressure upon legislators in an effort to influence the course of legislation. They must know, too, that agents of such groups infest state and national capitals, appear before committees, gum-shoe through lobbies and corridors, buttonholing "statesmen", prepare elaborate reports, draft legislation, issue statements to the press, create paper civic organizations as stooges, co-operate and connive with one another, urge their followers to write letters, memorials, and protests, and make general nuisances of themselves in most ingenious ways. They even bribe legislators, as Miss Zeller's discussion of the Thayer case shows. John Lewis and his CIO could learn much from a study of the legislative pickets of pressure groups. Miss Zeller reveals little that is new as to the methods employed, but her detailed examination of the major pressures that impinge upon a state legislature is unique. Representatives of organized labor, bankers, manufacturers, realtors, insurance companies, public utilities, farmers, welfare groups, educators, lawyers, doctors, public service employees, veterans, women's groups, religious and reform associations, flock to Albany to see that the "right" bill passes and the "wrong" bill fails. Miss Zeller discusses them all, one by one, showing how and why they are organized, their methods, their goals, and their power. The People! Yes. They are the people, for it is under the impact of the pulling and hauling, the competition and co-operation of such as they that the Empire State makes its laws. If Miss Zeller were as fluent as she obviously is industrious, her book would make a thrilling tale. PETER H. ODEGARD.

Pittsburgh's Post-Gazette: "The First Newspaper West of the Alleghenies". By J. CUTLER ANDREWS. (Boston, Chapman and Grimes, 1936, pp. vii, 324, $2.00.) One hundred and fifty years pass in review as Dr. Andrews tells the story of the first newspaper west of the Alleghenies. Following the career of such a newspaper, founded as it was in a frontier community that became a mighty city of industry and commerce, one sees the changing patterns of American life. The book is more than the history of a newspaper. It is a history of the "Gateway to the West" since 1786, as revealed by the newspaper files. The author deals only incidentally with the *Gazette's* influence on public opinion. The reader forms the impression that it was seldom of much force as a leader in public questions, frequently lagging behind popular sentiment, though after it graduated from Whiggery into the antislavery embrace of the Republican party it seemed to keep abreast of and sometimes to lead local public opinion. It had a long list of editors and owners, but few of them made any stir in American journalism. The author observes that "the Gazette was not usually known as a crusading journal", and this will be the conclusion of the reader. It offers valuable evidence, however, of the economic processes and social behavior during the long period

covered. Pittsburgh's early commercial rivalry with Wheeling, the attempt to get a canal and then a railroad from the East, the development of river traffic, the rise of steel and the steel kings, the Johnstown Flood, Coxey's Army, and the Homestead Strike are a few of the many matters on which the book reveals contemporary attitudes. It is interesting, easy to read, and free from the unscholarly exaggerations that impair most histories of newspapers. The quotations are judiciously selected, though one could wish there were more of them. The book is a demonstration of what can be done in local history by using the files of the local press. CULVER H. SMITH.

ARTICLES

THEODORE HORNBERGER. Puritanism and Science: The Relationship revealed in the Writings of John Cotton. *New Eng. Quar.*, Sept.

ROBERT A. EAST. New England Federalism, 1803-1814. *Ibid.*

H. C. WOODWORTH. A Century of Adjustments in a New Hampshire Back Area. *Agricultural Hist.*, July.

A. C. FLICK. How New York won and lost an Empire. *New York Hist.*, Oct.

LEE NEWCOMER. Chester A. Arthur: The Factors involved in his Removal from the New York Custom-House. *Ibid.*

LURA ANDERSON. Life in the Raritan Valley, 1775-1800. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, Oct.

C. LENNART CARLSON. Samuel Keimer: A Study in the Transit of English Culture to Colonial Pennsylvania. *Pensylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

MARGARET L. BROWN. Mr. and Mrs. William Bingham of Philadelphia. *Ibid.*, July.

Id. William Bingham, Eighteenth Century Magnate. *Ibid.*, Oct.

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER. Reed and Forde: Merchant Adventurers of Philadelphia. *Ibid.*, July.

EDGAR B. CALE. Editorial Sentiment in Pennsylvania in the Campaign of 1860. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, Oct.

DOCUMENTS

RAYMOND P. STEARNS, ed. Correspondence of John Woodridge, jr., and Richard Baxter [1669-1672]. *New Eng. Quar.*, Sept.

EMMA SCHEMEL, ed. A Swiss Surgeon visits Rhode Island, 1661-1662. *Ibid.*

PHILIP S. KLEIN, ed. Memoirs of a Senator from Pennsylvania: Jonathan Roberts, 1771-1854. *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN, ed. James Bouchard, S. J., French-Delaware Indian. *Mid-America*, Oct.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Tobacco Regulation in Colonial Maryland. By VERTREES J. WYCKOFF. [Johns Hopkins University Studies.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1936, pp. 228, $2.25.) This is an account of the attempts made by Maryland to control the production and marketing of its staple crop. Some attention is paid to the mercantilist policies of England, but in the main the scene is laid in the province itself. After introductory chapters on the early history of tobacco culture the story is one of recurring periods of overproduction, economic crises, and attempts to combat the consequent falling prices by stint laws and inspection laws which would reduce the quantity of tobacco raised and improve the quality of the marketed product. In this connection the author emphasizes the conflict of interests between the large and small planters which prevented for many decades the adoption of much-needed legislation. Because of its greater size and importance in the trade, Virginia almost inevitably took the lead in all matters relating to the staple. In the absence of any similar specialized study for the Old Dominion, it would have been desirable if Dr. Wyckoff had broadened his study to include a full examination of the control of tobacco in the other colonies where it was a principal export. We should then have had a much better balanced and more useful account of the general situation than the author is able to give us by

focusing his attention on the colony of secondary importance alone. As it is, he is constantly referring to conditions and developments in Virginia which were basic to any program of tobacco regulation but which, with his main interest in Maryland, he can deal with only in summarized fashion. Within the geographical limits he has set for himself, however, he has made a useful addition to our information on colonial economic problems. LEONARD W. LABAREE.

It's a Far Cry. By ROBERT WATSON WINSTON. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1937, pp. vi, 381, $3.00.) This charming autobiography bears out its author's reputation for wit and anecdote. Its discussion of the ante-bellum and Reconstruction South is based upon tradition, hearsay, and the reflections of mature scholarship. The firsthand narrative begins with the author's life at "Windsor Castle", on the coastal plain of North Carolina. It follows him to James H. Horner's classical school and on to Chapel Hill, where a brother had been appointed to the faculty to "give the heathen a chance". The law, thereafter, led him into politics, to the bench, into corporation practice, and before the Supreme Court. Retirement brought Judge Winston back to Chapel Hill, where he embarked upon his literary career. The Winstons of Bertie were a family of nonconformists whose liberalism deprived more than one brother of high office. Judge Winston poses as the sole "Bourbon" of the connection. As evidence he cites his youthful opposition to Walter Hines Page and the *State Chronicle*. His insistence while on the bench that the Negro receive his day in court suggests, however, kinship with the remainder of his clan. The criticism of slavery and secession and a candid discussion of Southern race relations are the most distinctive passages in a book replete with comment on the social and intellectual history of the New South. They continue the attempt to put an end to sectional bitterness, obscurantism, and racial exploitation that crowns Winston's old age with a liberalism matching any to be found in the contemporary South. CHESTER MCA. DESTLER.

Public Papers and Letters of Oliver Max Gardner, Governor of North Carolina, 1929-1933. Compiled by EDWIN GILL. Edited by DAVID LEROY CORBITT. (Raleigh, Council of State, 1937, pp. lxiii, 788.) It has become the practice in North Carolina to document the administration of a governor shortly after his retirement from office, and the practice has much to commend it; yet it may well be questioned whether it would not be better, instead of carrying this documentation to the extent of including the less consequential items, as in the present instance, to leave something for the future historian to dig up. It is quite possible that the beneficiary himself (or victim, as the case may be) might come to wish that the publication of some of his outpourings had been deferred. Three features in Governor Gardner's administration seem to stand out beyond all others: the successful manner in which he guided the state through the period of depression; the centralization in the state of many functions formerly local in their administration; and the consolidation of three separate state educational institutions into the University of North Carolina. The more than sixty public addresses, delivered on a great variety of occasions, give evidence, upon the whole, of a broad outlook and of human understanding. A biographical sketch of Governor Gardner by Allen Jay Maxwell is prefixed to this compilation.

The Coming Empire or Two Thousand Miles in Texas on Horseback. By Colonel NATHANIEL ALSTON TAYLOR. [Revised Edition.] (Dallas, Turner Company, 1936, pp. ix, 383, $2.50.) Six short articles which were not in the original edition of 1877 have been included in this revision.

Articles

MARJORIE STRATFORD MENDENHALL. The Rise of Southern Tenancy. *Yale Rev.*, Autumn.

CHESTER MCA. DESTLER. Perspective for the Southern Race Question. *Social Education*, Oct.

DANIEL M. ROBISON. From Tillman to Long: Some Striking Leaders of the Rural South. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR. The Papers of the Maryland State Colonization Society. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

AMY CHENEY CLINTON. Historic Fort Washington. *Ibid.*

LOUIS B. WRIGHT. The "Gentleman's Library" in Early Virginia: The Literary Interests of the First Carters. *Huntington Library Quar.*, Oct.

EDWARD A. WYATT, IV. Schools and Libraries in Petersburg, Virginia, prior to 1861. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.

JOSEPH C. ROBERT. [Robert E.] Lee the Farmer. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.

EDGAR ERSKINE HUME. Dormant Rights to Membership in the Society of the Cincinnati in the State of Virginia. *William and Mary Coll. Quar. Hist. Mag.*, July.

ROBERT W. BARNWELL, JR. The Migration of Loyalists from South Carolina. *Proc. South Carolina Hist. Assoc.*, 1937.

W. H. MILLS. The Thoroughbred in South Carolina. *Ibid.*

CHARLES JOSEPH GAYLE. The Nature and Volume of Exports from Charleston, 1724-1774. *Ibid.*

JAMES WELCH PATTON. The Work of Soldiers' Aid Societies in South Carolina during the Civil War. *Ibid.*

MABEL L. WEBBER. Sir Nathaniel Johnson and his son Robert, Governors of South Carolina. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, Oct.

MARK F. BOYD. Events at Prospect Bluff on the Apalachicola River, 1808-1818. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

F. W. HOSKINS. The St. Joseph Convention: The Making of Florida's First Constitution [cont.]. *Ibid.*

WALTER PRICHARD. The Romance of Research in Louisiana History. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, July.

ROGER WALLACE SHUGG. Survival of the Plantation System in Louisiana. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

ROGER P. MCCUTCHEON. Books and Booksellers in New Orleans, 1730-1830. *Ibid.*

B. I. WILEY. Vicissitudes of Early Reconstruction Farming in the Lower Mississippi Valley. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.

WILLIAM RANSOM HOGAN. Amusements in the Republic of Texas. *Ibid.*

Documents

PAUL EVANS and THOMAS P. GOVAN, eds. A Belgian Consul on Conditions in the South in 1860 and 1862. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.

J. G. D. PAUL, ed. A Lost Copy-Book of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, Sept.

ROBERT W. BARNWELL, JR., ed. Reports on Loyalist Exiles from South Carolina, 1783. *Proc. South Carolina Hist. Assoc.*, 1937.

WALTER PRICHARD, ed. George Graham's Mission to Galveston in 1818: Two Important Documents bearing upon Louisiana History. *Louisiana Hist. Quar.*, July.

JAMES A. PADGETT, ed. A Yankee School Teacher in Louisiana, 1835-1837: The Diary of Caroline B. Poole. *Ibid.*

Western Territories and States

The Tall Sycamore of the Wabash, Daniel Wolsey Voorhees. By LEONARD S. KENWORTHY. (Boston, Bruce Humphries, 1936, pp. 155, $2.00.) In this brief and somewhat sketchy biography Mr. Kenworthy has characterized Daniel W. Voorhees as "an outstanding example of the bold and boisterous frontier democracy of the nineteenth century". He was all this and something more.

Entering Congress from Indiana in 1861, he was one of the fiercest of the Northern Democrats in their criticisms of Republican war policies, as he was also of the radical Reconstruction policy. After Reconstruction he continued to hold a conspicuous place among Democrats, first in the House of Representatives, then in the Senate, becoming one of the chief champions of the West in its contention for currency expansion. Apart from politics Voorhees won a national reputation as a skillful practitioner at the bar and as an orator.

Rediscovering Illinois: Archaeological Explorations in and around Fulton County. By FAY-COOPER COLE. (Chicago, University Press, 1937, pp. xvi, 295, $2.00.) This volume is the first of a series of studies dealing with the archaeology of Illinois. For the general reader "interested in the prehistoric inhabitants of the Mississippi Valley" there are an introductory and a concluding chapter. The rest of the book gives the "more technical aspects of excavation and classification on which the general account is based".

Illinois State Historical Society Transactions for the Year 1936: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, Papers presented at that Time, and Contributions to State History. (Springfield, Illinois State Historical Library, 1937, pp. vii, 194.) This volume contains, besides the proceedings of the society at its annual meeting, May 15-16, and a list of acquisitions in genealogy and local history, a study, by Paul M. Angle, of the life of Nathaniel Pope (1784-1850) and the papers read at the annual meeting. These are: "The Beginning of a State Park System for Illinois" by James A. James, "State Parks and Illinois History [illustrated]" by Robert Kingery, "The French Régime in Illinois: A Challenge to Historical Scholarship" by Theodore C. Pease, "Sources of Early Illinois Culture" by Earl W. Hayter, and "Source Material in the Teaching of Illinois History" by Neil B. Waldron.

Debates of the Missouri Constitutional Convention of 1875. Volume III. Edited by ISIDOR LOEB and FLOYD C. SHOEMAKER. (Columbia, State Historical Society of Missouri, 1936, pp. 464, $1.45.) The debates of the Convention from the 19th to the 22d days, covering the period from May 26 to June 1, 1875, are included in this volume.

Norwegian-American Studies and Records. Volume IX. (Northfield, Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1936, pp. 131, $2.00.) This volume includes four historical essays, namely: "Immigration and Puritanism" by Marcus L. Hansen, "Svein Nilsson, Pioneer Norwegian-American Historian" by D. G. Ristad, "A Typical Norwegian Settlement: Spring Grove, Minnesota" by Carlton C. Qualey, and "The Collection and Preservation of Sources" by Laurence M. Larson. There are also four contributions which are chiefly documentary in character: "The Sugar Creek Settlement in Iowa" by H. F. Swansen, "Pioneer Town Building in the West: An American Letter written by Frithjof Meidell at Springfield, Illinois, in 1855" translated, with a foreword, by Clarence A. Clausen, "Marcus Thrane in America: Some Unpublished Letters, 1880-1884" translated and edited by Waldemar Westergaard, and "The Missouri Flood of 1881" by Halvor B. Hustvedt, translated by Katherine Hustvedt. Theodore C. Blegen contributes a preface.

A Historical, Political, and Natural Description of California by Pedro Fages, Soldier of Spain. Translated by HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1937, pp. xi, 83, $1.50.) The present translation, which

originally appeared in the *Catholic Historical Review* in 1919, has been reprinted to make it "available to a wider circle of readers".

Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Building Trades. By FREDERICK L. RYAN. (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1936, pp. ix, 241, $3.00.) Few groups in the American labor force have been more craft-minded than the workers in the building trades. In San Francisco, as elsewhere, they early organized in craft unions and endeavored to establish uniform industrial rules and practices. Industrial relations and unionism in the San Francisco building trades have more than local significance. Their history reflects developments in and throws additional light upon the entire national labor scene. In this excellent monograph, the product of exhaustive study of the field, Professor Ryan considers the history of the unions of the building trades, the San Francisco Building Trades Council, hours, wages, and working rules under closed and open-shop conditions, employer policies, the activities of the famous San Francisco Industrial Association, and the role of the unions in city politics. Fortunately the author's scholarship and objectivity have not prevented him from making forthright judgments. He sharply indicts the narrow craft and political policies of the unions which were shaped by the Building Trades Council controlled by the astute P. H. McCarthy. These policies largely caused the ultimate collapse of the building trades craft unions. "Business unionism" won gains for individual crafts at the cost of injuring labor as a whole. McCarthy willingly sacrificed union strength and even existence in order to maintain power. Un-co-ordinated political action and the political rivalries of union leaders also played a leading role in weakening the unions. Professor Ryan, carrying his story through 1935, concludes that craft organization in the building trades has outlived its period of usefulness. He holds that the only major hope for regenerating the unions lies in the recent rank and file developments in the direction of industrial unionism and in the appearance of a distinct independent labor party. HENRY DAVID.

Nativism in the Old Northwest, 1850-1860. By Sister M. EVANGELINE THOMAS. (Washington, Catholic University of America, 1936, pp. vii, 270, $1.25.) This volume, a doctoral thesis, traces the rise and decline of a new wave of native Americanism which swept, in the early fifties, from older centers on the Atlantic seaboard to the Northwest. The author devotes considerable attention to the pertinent religious, social, and economic forces in her description of conditions before 1850. With the rise of the Know-Nothing movement in the decade in question the treatment becomes largely political. She presents several conclusions of interest. The movement differed from its eastern counterpart in that it was predominantly religious and economic rather than political and was aimed at the Germans and Scandinavians rather than the Irish. Politically, Nativism reached its height in 1855 and then was gradually absorbed by the Republican party. The Native Americans made less headway in the Northwest than in other parts of the country primarily because the West needed people and desired unrestricted immigration. Moreover, both the political parties desired the foreign vote, a fact which tempered the demands of even the Know-Nothing factions. The volume contains some slips in proofreading and is rather weak in structure. Thus the position of "Fusionists" in 1855 is not entirely clear. Minor criticisms would include the fact that the stand of Stephen A. Douglas as described on pages 133 and 162 seems contradictory, and the varying use of the term "Puritan" is confusing. There is a bibliography and an index.

FREDERICK L. BRONNER.

My Pioneer Past. By Guy Waring. With an Introduction by Owen Wister. (Boston, Bruce Humphries, 1936, pp. 256, $2.75.) The author's foreword states that this book is based largely upon a journal kept during three years (1885-1888) of residence in the Okanagan region of the present state of Washington. Now, nearly fifty years later, from these rather fragmentary notes, he has filled out the narrative of his experiences. As a record of events long past, therefore, it lacks both the authority and pungent flavor of a contemporary document. Nevertheless the narrative is related in a style so minutely detailed that one feels that the author has been exceedingly meticulous in his efforts to be accurate, however much the subject matter may have suffered in interest. As a story of pioneer life in the eighties, it contains several interesting high lights—pictures of the lawless mining town of Ruby, of primitive methods of surgery, of a forest fire which served as a protection from a band of drunken Siwashes, and characterizations of old Sarsupekin, Wild Goose Bill, and noble little Father de Rougé. But in the main it is an uneventful tale, simply told and overshadowed by Owen Wister's brilliant introduction. The illustrations and especially the maps are excellent, and there is an adequate index. To those who have experienced a similar period in the Northwest, or who are interested in reconstructing the daily details of local ranch life, this narrative will prove of great interest.

Dorothy P. Hulbert.

Articles

Samuel L. Wilson. John Bradford, Kentucky's First Printer. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Eliza Calvert Hall. Bowling Green and the Civil War. *Ibid.*

Stanley J. Folmsbee. The Turnpike Phase of Tennessee's Internal Improvement System of 1836-1838. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Nov.

F. Garvin Davenport. Cultural Life in Nashville on the Eve of the Civil War. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, Aug.

Charles K. Palmer. Ohio Valley Commerce, 1787-1936. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, June.

Paul R. Grim. The Rev. John Rankin, Early Abolitionist. *Ohio State Archeol. and Hist. Quar.*, July.

B. H. Pershing. A Surveyor on the Seven Ranges [Major Winthrop Sargent]. *Ibid.*

Evelyn A. Cummins. The Beginnings of the Church in Ohio and Kenyon College. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Epis. Church*, Sept.

B. Z. Stambaugh. The McIlvaine Episcopate. *Ibid.*

Thomas Lloyd Bush. The Diocese of Southern Ohio and its Bishops. *Ibid.*

Louis E. Daniels. The Diocese of Ohio, 1874-1937. *Ibid.*

E. Clowes Chorley. The Cincinnati General Conventions of 1850 and 1910. *Ibid.*

Walter Shea Wood. The 130th Infantry, Illinois National Guard: A Military History, 1778-1919. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, July.

Josephine Boylan. The Illinois Railroad and its Successors. *Ibid.*

Priscilla Bradford. The Missouri Constitutional Controversy of 1845. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Marshall Smelser. The Food Supply of Creole St. Louis. *Mid-America*, Oct.

Mabel E. Smith. Governor William Woodbridge [1780-1861]. *Michigan Hist. Mag.*, Summer-Autumn.

Jacob A. Swisher and Jack T. Johnson. The Legislation of the Forty-Seventh General Assembly. *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol.*

Theodore C. Blegen. Fort St. Charles and the Northwest Angle. *Minnesota Hist.*, Sept.

Thomas E. Drake. Quakers in Minnesota. *Ibid.*

Bertha L. Heilbron. The State Historical Convention of 1937. *Ibid.*

Martha B. Caldwell. The Stubbs [Kansas Rifles]. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, May.

D. R. Burleigh. The Burlington First Main Line. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, Jan., 1937.

Lewis E. Atherton. Disorganizing Effects of the Mexican War on the Santa Fé Trade. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, May.

William Henry Ellison. History of the Santa Cruz Island Grant. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

Harold F. Taggart. California and the Silver Question in 1895. *Ibid.*

J. Orin Oliphant. George Simpson and Oregon Missions. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

Eric W. Allen. Oregon Journalism in 1887. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, Sept.

J. F. Roush. Legislative Reapportionment in Washington State. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, July.

Harold E. Briggs. The Early Development of Sheep Ranching in the Northwest. *Agricultural Hist.*, July.

Documents

C. B. Rollins, ed. Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins, I. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

Mabel Hill. Paul Hill, Railroad Builder [includes letters, diaries, and other documents from the Paul Hill Papers]. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, Jan., 1937.

LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

W. S. Robertson

Histories and Historians of Hispanic America: A Bibliographical Essay. By A. Curtis Wilgus. (Washington, Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association, Library of Congress, 1936, pp. xiii, 113, $1.00.) In this small volume Professor Wilgus lists with brief comment some of the outstanding works of more than nine hundred authors, whose historical writings are classified chronologically and geographically in accordance with the areas discussed. In addition he includes without critical comment approximately 150 bibliographies and aids. Specialists in the field may complain because of certain omissions, disagree with some of the author's estimates of the value of the works, and point out that he presents rather scanty information regarding the historians. This is natural and to be expected. The author does not pretend that his work is exhaustive; it could not be so within so small a compass. Despite its minor defects, the reviewer believes that it is one of the best manuals of its kind that has appeared in any language. Teachers of undergraduates and graduates as well will find it most helpful. They should be able without great difficulty to supplement the information and correct the errors of appreciation which it contains. It is to be hoped that the author's intention to publish a critical bibliography of Hispanic-American biography will be carried out in the near future. J. Fred Rippy.

A Check List of Manuscripts in the Edward E. Ayer Collection. Compiled by Ruth Lapham Butler. (Chicago, Newberry Library, 1937, pp. viii, 295, $5.00.) This is a very useful finding list of a valuable collection of manuscripts in the Newberry Library concerning English America, Spanish America, Indian languages, the Philippine Islands and languages, and the Hawaiian Islands and languages. A careful index of seventy pages refers to item numbers.

Vida de Juan Montalvo. By Oscar Efren Reyes. (Quito, Edicion del Grupo America, 1935, pp. 418.) This is a biography of a great Ecuadorian literary figure. Literature and politics were for Juan Montalvo as closely knit as they were for many South American literary men of the last century. It would in fact be difficult to separate the politician from the man of letters. But Montalvo's influence was primarily that of a great stylist with a considerable hold upon the younger writers of his day. His major political activity was the embittered controversy with Garcia Moreno, whose political ideas and practices made him a unique figure in a century of Latin-American history that was replete with the

unusual and the unexpected in political types. Some of Montalvo's most popular pieces were written in condemnation of Moreno. In fact, when the latter was hacked to death by a student in Quito, Montalvo, then in exile across the border in Ipiales, shouted in exultation, "my pen killed him". Students of South American history will find this volume interesting for the light it throws upon the Garcia Moreno period in Ecuadorian history. FRANK TANNENBAUM.

The Ejido: Mexico's Way Out. By EYLER N. SIMPSON. With a Foreword by Ramón Beteta. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1937, pp. xxi, 849, $5.00.) A play on words gives title to this valuable study. The term "ejido", now applied to all land collectively held by a village, formerly was used to designate the commons at the "exit" of a Spanish town. Simpson thinks that the village-owned ejido, already demonstrated to be the best unit for the production of corn and becoming the best for other sustenance crops, offers Mexico a "way out" of her agricultural problems. It offers a way out industrially as well, he says. Mexico is being drawn into the current of mechanized civilization, but with her seventy-two thousand villages, only one city over a million, and but eleven over fifty thousand, she should be able to organize directly into the small-unit industrial system, avoiding the ills of congested settlements. This broad concept of the ejido is, however, "a notion hardly yet glimpsed by the Mexican leaders themselves". At any rate, Simpson has produced a much needed work. Particularly valuable are the six "case" studies, close-ups of representative land-holding pueblos. One might wish that more space had been given to such intimate pictures of agrarian communities, less to polemics over controversial points. Of importance, too, are the facts regarding progress in the agrarian program. Over four thousand towns have received land, but this provides for less than one third of the agricultural laborers, some two and a half million still being landless. Moreover, most of the ejidos afford a bare subsistence. Nor has the hacienda system been abolished. Over 90 per cent of all farm land is still privately owned, 83 per cent being in properties of over one thousand hectares. Although much sped up since the publication of this volume, the agrarian reform is far from complete. "Mexico is still predominantly the land of haciendas and hacendados" (p. 208). GEORGE MCCUTCHEN MCBRIDE.

El Argos de Buenos Aires, 1822: Reimpresión facsimile dirigida por los señores Antonio Dellepiane, Mariano de Vedia y Mitre y Rómulo Zabala y prologada por el señor Arturo Capdevila. [Biblioteca de la Junta de Historia y Numismática Americana, vol. XIV.] (Buenos Aires, Atelier de Artes Gráficas "Futura", 1937, pp. 404.)

Boletín bibliográfico de antropología americana of the *Instituto panamericana de geografía é historia,* vol. I, no. 3. (Mexico, 1937.) Contains bibliographical data concerning ethnography, linguistics, and archaeology of Mexico and Central America.

Bolívar y Pétion. By L. A. CUERVO. (Bogotá, El Gráfico, 1937, pp. 28.)

Breve historia de México. By J. VASCONCELOS. (Mexico, 1937, pp. 638.)

Ibero-Amerikanische Bibliographie: XXIX, Verzeichnis der deutschsprachigen Literatur. By HANS PRAESENT. (Berlin, Ferd. Dummler, 1937, pp. 27.) This pamphlet contains a very useful list of recent publications in German relating to Latin America.

Nosotros: Número extraordinario dedicado al 11º congreso internacional de historia de América. [Suplemento del No. 16.] (Buenos Aires, Editorial Pan-América,

1937, pp. 199.) This contains addresses made at the recent historical congress at Buenos Aires by delegates and Argentine officials.

Pan American Institute of Geography and History: Proceedings of the Second General Assembly, held at Washington, October 14-19, 1935. [Department of State, Conference Series, No. 28. Publication No. 995.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1937, pp. xii, 540, 60 cents.)

Raíces del 10 de Octubre de 1868: Aguilera y Céspedes. By G. G. Castellanos. [Academia de la historia de Cuba.] (Havana, El Siglo XX, 1937, pp. 152.)

A Report on the Spanish Archives in San Antonio, Texas. By C. E. Castañeda. Volume I. (San Antonio, Yanaguana Society, 1937, pp. 167.)

Don Pedro de Cevallos, gobernador de Buenos Aires y virrey del Río de la Plata. By E. M. Barba. (La Plata, Coni, 1937, pp. 237, viii.) An elaborated doctoral dissertation which is Volume XIX in the Biblioteca humanidades of the University of La Plata.

San Martín, Argentiniens grosser Befreier und Staatengründer in Südamerika: Ein Lebensbild. By F. Kienze. (Berlin, Metzner, 1937, pp. 67.)

Semanario de agricultura, industria, y comercio: Reimpresión facsimile publicado por la Junta de Historia y Numismática Americana, 1804-1807. Volumes III-V. (Buenos Aires, Soc. Anón. de Impresiones Generales, 1937, pp. 416, 352, 170.)

Quilmes Colonial. By G. Sors. (La Plata, Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, 1937, pp. 145.) A documented monograph, with bibliography, narrating the history of a town in the province of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Land of Tomorrow: A Story of South America. By R. W. Thompson. (New York, Appleton-Century, 1937, pp. 459, $4.00.) An account of a trip to South America.

Articles

M. Aguilera. La antropófagia de las tribus americanas. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Mar.

G. Arbaiza. Monroe Doctrine: 1937 Style. *Current Hist.*, June.

A. Arboleda. La lepra de Quesada. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Mar.

L. Avilés Pérez. Anotaciones sobre María Antonia Bolívar. *Ibid.*, Feb.

C. Beals. Pan-Americanism: 1937 Style. *Pol. Quar.*, Oct.

S. H. Birdseye. The El Salvador-Guatemala Boundary Survey. *Bull. Pan Am. Union*, Oct.

W. Burton. South American Grab-bag. *Current Hist.*, Nov.

J. Caillet-Bois. El romanticismo en el Río de la Plata. *Nosotros*, Sept.

Contribución á la historia de la prensa periódica. *Bol. Arch. Nac.*, Jan.

C. Convers Fonnegra. Ciudades fundadas en Tierra Firme de 1525 á 1550. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Apr., May, Nov.

D. C. Corbitt. The Junta de Fomento of Havana and the López Expeditions. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Aug.

A. Currea Restrepo. La imprenta en Santa Fé y Bogotá. *Ibid.*, Apr.

S. Cuthbertson. Scott's Influence on José Mármol's "El Cruzado". *Hispania*, Oct.

P. J. Dousdebés. Las insignias de Colombia: Estudio crítico de su historia y evolución desde la conquista hasta nuestros días. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Aug.

The Editors. South America, I [Brazil]. *Fortune*, Dec.

C. Fiebrig. Was ist der Chaco? *Ibero-Am. Arch.*, July.

J. Fombona-Pachano. Poesía culto y popular de Venezuela. *Rev. Hisp. Mod.*, Apr.

C. García-Prada. El movimiento educacional colombiano. *Hispania*, Oct.

M. A. Hobig. The Builders of San Xavier del Bac. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

Simon G. Hanson. The Farquhar Syndicate in South America. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Aug.

H. Hauser. Notes et réflexions sur le travail historique au Brésil. *Rev. Hist.*, Jan.

Id. Patriotisme brésilien. *Rev. Pol. et Parlementaire*, Oct.

G. Hernández de Alba. Escudo de Bogotá. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Apr.

H. Herring. Argentina: The United States of the South. *Yale Rev.*, Autumn.

C. Hull. The Results and Significance of the Buenos Aires Conference. *For. Affairs*, special suppl., XV, no. 3.

D. Kress. El peso de la influencia francesa en la renovación de la prosa hispanoamericana. *Hispania*, May.

F. P. Laplaza. La conferencia interamericana de la paz. *Nosotros*, Aug.

R. Lehmann-Nitsche. Einzelheiten zur Entdeckungs und Kulturgeschichte der östlichen Südamerika: II, Die Patagonier des Magallanes, 1520. *Ibero-Am. Arch.*, July.

David A. Lockmiller. Agriculture in Cuba during the Second United States Intervention, 1906-1909. *Agricultural Hist.*, July.

R. Maack. Die neuerschlossenen Siedlungsgebiete und Siedlungen im Staate Paraná. *Ibero-Am. Arch.*, July.

L. Martínez Delgado. Carlos Martínez Silva. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, June.

Id. Federico González Suárez. *Ibid.*, Mar.

Pierre Monbeig. Les zones pionnières de l'État de São Paulo. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, July.

F. A. Moreno y Escandón. Estado del Virreinato de Santaté, Nuevo Reino de Granada. *Ibid.*, Sept.

En la muerte de Dr. Carlos E. Restrepo (Del homenaje colombiano): Párrafos sacados de El Tiempo, Bogotá, ediciones de 7, 16 y 18 de Julio de 1937. *Repertorio Americano*, Aug. 14.

R. Murphy. The Journey of Pedro de Rivera, 1724-1728. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, Oct.

E. Ortega Ricaurte. La nueva ciudad de Toro. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, May.

G. Otero Muñoz. Soledad Acosta de Samper. *Ibid.*

P. T. Pages. Balance actual de la política economía y finanzas argentinas. *Hechos é Ideas*, Aug.

Le Paraguay et la Société des Nations. *Rev. Droit Internat.*, Apr.

A. S. Pearse. The Maya Country in Yucatan. *Scientific Monthly*, Nov.

C. Pierce. The Panama Libel Cases. *Indiana Mag. Hist.*, June.

F. J. Ponte Domínguez. Las guerras de España á fines del siglo XVIII y su trascendencia para Cuba. *Bol. Arch. Nac.*, Jan.

E. Posada. Juan José Neira. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Feb.

I. M. Quijano Otero. El 20 de Julio de 1810. *Ibid.*, Jan.

J. do Rego Monteiro. Dominação hespanhola no Rio Grande do Sul, 1763-1777. *Rev. Militar Brasileira*, Oct.

A. Robledo. El Congreso de Panamá. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, July.

A. Salgado dos Santos. Ituzaingó e o Marquez de Barbacena. *Rev. Militar Brasileira*, Oct.

E. Schäfer. Das spanisch-amerikanische Kolonialreich. *Ibero-Am. Arch.*, July.

F. V. Scholes. Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, Oct.

J. R. Spell. Mexican Literary Periodicals of the Nineteenth Century. *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Mar.

H. J. Spinden. The Mayas—America's First High Civilization. *Bull. Pan Am. Union*, Sept.

J. Torre Revello. Miguel de Rifos, compañero de Caboto. *Nosotros*, Sept.

Arthur P. Whitaker. The Pseudo-Aranda Memoir of 1783. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, Aug.

G. Wythe. Pan Americanism, Economic and Cultural. *Southwest Rev.*, Winter.

J. M. Yepes. La conception américaine de la paix et la Conférence de Buenos-Aires. *Rev. Gen. Droit Internat. Pub.*, May.

Documents

A. S. Aiton and A. Rey, eds. Coronado's Testimony in the Viceroy Mendoza *Residencia*. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, July.

Archivo Histórico del Ministerio de Guerra: Hojas de servicio en la guerra de la independencia, jefes y oficiales de marina. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Nov.

Una carta inédita de Bolívar. *Ibid.*, July.

Documentos relacionados con la expedición de los Cayos. *Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.

Epistolario de la revolución de 1895. *Bol. Arch. Nac.*, Jan.

El Instituto Sanmartiniano: Editorial de El Tiempo, Bogotá, Julio 9 de 1937. *Repertorio Americano*, Aug. 7.

V. Lecuna, ed. Documentos inéditos para la historia de Bolívar [cont.]. *Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.

F. A. Moreno. Método provisional é interino de las estudios que han de observar los colegios de Santa Fé por ahora, y hasta tanto que se erige universidad pública, ó su Magestad dispone otra cosa. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, Sept.

J. Obando Lombana, ed. Hoja de servicios del General José María Obando. *Ibid.*

La obra del gobierno radical de Córdoba: Mensaje leido por el Gobernador Dr. Amadeo Sabattini ante la H. Legislatura. *Hechos é Ideas*, May.

Real orden contentiva de la lista de los procesados y expulsados de la Isla de Cuba por disposición del Gobernador y Capitán General D. Miguel Tacón. *Bol. Arch. Nac.*, Jan.

C. Restrepo Canal, ed. Documentos del archivo nacional. *Bol. Hist. Antig.*, June.

Id. Documentos sobre esclavos. *Ibid.*, Aug.

E. Restrepo Tirado, ed. Documentos del Archivo de Indias: Jiménez de Quesada contra Lugo y otros pleitos contra Jiménez de Quesada. *Ibid.*, Sept.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The following should be added to the *List of Research Projects in History, exclusive of Doctoral Dissertations*, published as a supplement to Volume XXXIX, No. 3, of the *American Historical Review*:

XVIII. United States of America

(5) Religious

The missionary advance into the Pacific Northwest. Prog. 3 yrs. J. Orin Oliphant, *Bucknell*.

(7) Before 1782

A biography of Francis Nicholson. Prog. 2 yrs. Leonidas Dodson, *Pennsylvania*.

OTHER HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: one volume of certified copies of the opinions of the Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1790 to 1800; additional photostats of letters of George Washington; a long poem by Abraham Lincoln, inspired by a visit to his childhood home in Indiana in the fall of 1844; sixty-eight additional papers of Richard Stoddert Ewell, mainly 1844 to 1871; one box of papers of Charles Bruce (father of William Cabell Bruce); a typewritten copy of recollections of the Knoxville campaign, etc., by Edward Porter Alexander, 1863 to 1865; twenty-nine letters of John Sherman, 1893 to 1898; and consignments of photostats from the British Public Record Office.

The records of the Department of Justice and of the Attorney General of the United States from their beginning to 1903, with the exception of personnel records, have recently been transferred to the National Archives. The collection includes correspondence with United States marshals and district attorneys, correspondence with other agencies of the government, opinions of the Attorney General, docket books and a few papers relating to French spoliation cases, 1885-1903, records relating to California land grants, 1851-58, records of cases before the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission of 1901-10, and correspondence and other records of the Solicitor of the Treasury, 1821-88. The last group of records was originally accumulated in the Department of the Treasury but was transferred a few years ago to the Department of Justice. Among other archival materials recently received by the National Archives are sixty-five volumes of records of the United

States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, 1791-1913, including dockets, calendars, minutes, records of copyrights (1796-1802, 1811-57), and correspondence and other records of the North Carolina Lumber Company of Tillery, N. C., 1905-8; scientific records of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1832-1934, consisting of tide readings, sounding records, seismograph readings, and magnetic observatory records; records of the Commission of Fine Arts that relate to completed projects, 1910-36; minute books of the United States Shipping Board and the Merchant Fleet Corporation, 1917-36; consular reports on trade, shipping, and politics, 1925-31; and motion-picture films, some with sound track, illustrative of activities of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Fisheries, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The John Carter Brown Library *Annual Report*, 1936-1937, is largely a discourse on the significant acquisitions of the year, which range chronologically from early sixteenth century works on the discovery of America to the Revolutionary period and beyond, including some rare Franklin items.

A miscellaneous collection of manuscripts and printed materials of Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont has recently come into the possession of the Cornell University Library. It contains over three hundred letters from Greeley, Stevens, Seward, Blaine, John Sherman, Simon Cameron, Edmunds, and numerous other politicians, also eighty manuscripts of speeches and notes many of which were never published, a printed catalogue of the Morrill library, and numerous clippings.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has acquired a collection of some five thousand manuscripts, designated as the Gibson Northumberland Papers, which, though predominantly legal in character, "will provide a fund of material illustrating the history of one of the 'back counties' of Pennsylvania". There are letters dating from 1793 to 1867, deeds and surveys from about the beginning of the Revolution to the mid-nineteenth century, materials relating to canal and railroad building, etc.

The trustees of the Rutherford B. Hayes-Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation announce the appointment of Curtis W. Garrison, formerly archivist of Pennsylvania, as director of research in the Hayes Memorial Library, Fremont, Ohio. Dr. Garrison was for a number of years assistant in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. To the large collection of Hayes papers, pamphlets, etc. in the Hayes Memorial Library the foundation expects to add other source material on the later Reconstruction era, the Hayes administration, and certain problems of American life up to 1890. The foundation offers every facility to students whose studies touch these fields, including film camera reproductions for those who cannot travel to Fremont.

The Minnesota Historical Society has acquired a large collection of the papers of Lynn Haines, editor of *Searchlight on Congress* from 1916 to 1927. The collection includes, besides numerous letters from people of

prominence, material relating to the National War Labor Board and the minutes of the Democratic caucuses of the House of Representatives, 1911-13.

Under the direction of a Committee on University Archives and the immediate supervision of Professor Lewis G. Vander Velde and two assistants, the University of Michigan has undertaken a program of collecting manuscript and printed materials pertaining to its history. Particular attention has been paid to the papers of regents, former faculty members, and administrative officials. Since this personnel includes many individuals also prominent in nonacademic phases of Michigan history, the rapidly growing collection is proving to be one of importance in the history of the state. In fact one of the chief objectives of the program is the accumulation of materials for the use of research students in Michigan history. For the time being the Michigan Collection is housed in a separate room in the William L. Clements Library. It is hoped that before long more extensive quarters will be available. Readers of the *Review* who have knowledge of materials properly belonging in such a collection are invited to correspond with Professor Vander Velde.

The sixth annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Historical Association, held in Lancaster on October 15 and 16, was the largest and most successful in the history of the association. The members assisted in the sesquicentennial celebration of Franklin and Marshall College and in the dedication as a national shrine of Wheatland, the former home of James Buchanan, Pennsylvania's only President of the United States. Dr. Roy F. Nichols, president of the association, delivered the main address at the dedication of the Keiper Liberal Arts building at the college; Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox, president of Union College, a charter member of the association, spoke at the opening session of the Franklin and Marshall celebration; and Dr. H. M. J. Klein gave the principal address at the dedication of Wheatland. There were several excellent papers. During the coming year the association plans to co-operate more extensively with the history teachers in the secondary schools of Pennsylvania and will add a new section to its magazine, *Pennsylvania History,* devoted to their interests. Persons desiring information about the association or *Pennsylvania History* are invited to communicate with the secretary, Dr. J. Paul Selsam, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

The first meeting of German historians since the National Socialist revolution was held in Erfurt on July 5, 6, and 7. The attendance was larger than at any previous time in the history of these gatherings. "It was above all a meeting of the young", states Dr. Erich Botzenhart in his account of it in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (CLVI, no. 3); but, he adds, old and young historians found themselves in magnificent unison. For apparently everyone agreed with Hitler's admonition to the historians to produce histories "derived in a clear line from the folk spirit" and with the directions

to the historians from Walter Frank, the official leader, to combine enthusiasm with ability so as "to proclaim strongheartedly great deeds and thus to help develop a people that not only understands great deeds but is also able to perform them". The keynote of the meeting was given in a toast by Dr. Frank to "the harmony of state and spirit, of might and culture". Dr. Botzenhart reports that the meeting showed no indications of dictatorial restrictions, that on the contrary it offered "a picture of the most active intellectual movement". He found that the younger historians were preserving the great traditions and the methods of German historiography and that they were expanding into new areas of interest and were comprehending these and the older areas from the new national socialistic view of history. The discussions at the meeting were, Dr. Botzenhart reports, based on the acceptance of three principles, which, he adds, are the foundations of contemporary historical work in Germany: "The recognition that all historical writing can only be political historical writing, that race and folkdom are the carrying and forming factors in historical development, and that German historical writing at the present day is and must be the history of all the Germans." To illustrate these principles Dr. Botzenhart analyzed some addresses that were delivered at the meeting. An adequate method for achieving the national socialistic form of history has not as yet been found, and, in view of the strangling of the theoretical discussion of social questions, one need not expect too much of German historical research along these lines. Scholars of Jewish blood are finding it difficult to obtain publishers for their works and probably will very soon be unable to do so at all. In fact, books or articles by any historian not fully approved by the National Socialist party are being killed by devious ways of censorship.

During the past summer a closed meeting was held of the *Forschungsabteilung Judenfrage des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands*. Prominent scholars in the natural sciences, philosophy, literature, history, and so forth, and important personages from practical life, especially from political life, attended and read papers. Gauleiter Streicher, the famous editor of *Der Stürmer,* was on the program alongside Professor Dr. Franz Koch, Professor Dr. Max Wundt, and others. The report of the meeting given in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (CLVI, no. 3) ends as follows: "Moreover this contact between research (*Wissenschaft*) and politics serves to unify the intellectual life of the nation because the historian forges weapons for the politician. It deepens for the latter his understanding of the historical struggle of the present from the past and at the same time the former on his part receives from the political leader new problems and points of view." The function of the scholar in the National Socialist state needs no further comment.

The Institut pour l'étude de l'histoire universelle has recently been established at Bucharest at the initiative of the Rumanian government.

Professor Iorga, its director, has announced that its quarterly, the *Revue historique du Sud-Est européen,* and annual bulletin will be available to investigators. In order to strengthen relations between Rumanian and foreign scholarship the institute will hold public conferences to which scholars from all countries will be invited.

A hopeful sign of cultural communion between the Irish Free State and Northern Ireland is the establishment by the Irish Historical Society and the Ulster Society for Irish Historical Studies of a new historical journal, *Irish Historical Studies.* It will be edited jointly by the secretaries of the two societies and will appear twice a year, in March and September, beginning with March of the present year if a sufficient number of subscribers is enrolled. In addition to articles, it is planned to publish concise statements, of special interest to teachers, showing how received views on particular questions have been modified by recent historical discoveries; select bibliographies and guides to sources; lists of new publications on Irish history; reviews; and notes and queries.

The Institut zur Erforschung des deutschen Volkstums im Süden und Südosten, located in Munich, has begun to publish a magazine, *Südostdeutsche Forschungen,* under the editorship of Dr. Fritz Valjavec (Verlag Max Schick, Theresienstr. 51, Munich, 7 M.). The table of contents reveals that the magazine treats all phases of the history of its subject. It appears once a year. The first volume was published in 1936 and ran to 311 pages. The second volume, that for 1937, is in two parts and includes 426 pages and a number of maps.

The first number of a periodical entitled *Jomsburg, Völker und Staaten im Osten und Norden Europas* (S. Hirzel Verlag, Leipzig) and devoted to the area lying between the Elbe and the western boundary of Soviet Russia, the Danish Sound and the Carpathians, appeared in April, 1937. The journal will be published quarterly, and the four issues will contain at least four hundred pages and forty-eight pictures and maps. The editors are Johannes Papritz and Wilhelm Koppe, and the editorial board consists of Hermann Aubin, Albert Brackmann, Theodor Oberländer, Walther Recke, Fritz Rörig, Otto Scheel, and Hans Übersberger. All phases of life will be treated, and as the editors aim to interest both the academic world and the public at large, the price for a year's subscription amounts to only 5 M.

With its twelfth issue, that of December, *Events* completed its first year of publication as a monthly review of world affairs. It was founded by Spencer Brodney, who was for many years on the staff of *Current History* and its editor until that magazine ceased to be published by the *New York Times.* The aim of *Events* is to bring the scholarship of the historian, the political scientist, and the economist to bear upon the recording and interpretation of events and developments throughout the world. For that reason its articles are written almost entirely by members of the faculties of

American colleges and universities. Among the contributors during the first year have been: Charles A. Beard, Robert C. Binkley, Edwin Borchard, A. L. Burt, N. A. N. Cleven, Charles W. Cole, Alzada Comstock, Harold U. Faulkner, Sidney B. Fay, Wilson Gee, Leo Gershoy, Herbert Heaton, Walter C. Langsam, William E. Lingelbach, Albert Howe Lybyer, William T. Morgan, Allan Nevins, Thomas P. Oakley, Frederic A. Ogg, Paul S. Peirce, Lindsay Rogers, J. Fred Rippy, J. Salwyn Schapiro, Frederick L. Schuman, Fred A. Shannon, Preston Slosson, and G. Nye Steiger. Arrangements are being made with others who are professionally engaged in the teaching and writing of history to contribute during the coming year. One result of this editorial policy has been that *Events* has been coming increasingly into use in schools and colleges in the history and social science departments.

In connection with the centennial of the founding of Trinity College, now a part of Duke University, which is to be celebrated during the academic year 1938-39, the Duke University Press announces a prize of $1500, to be awarded on March 1, 1939, for the best manuscript essay in the field of the social, literary, or artistic history of the United States. Essays must be not less than 50,000 words in length. Any scholar in the United States excepting members of the faculty of Duke University is eligible to compete. The winning manuscript will be published by the Duke University Press. Professor William T. Laprade is chairman of the Duke faculty committee which is in charge of the competition.

The Elizabeth Clay Howald Scholarship in the Ohio State University, which carries a stipend of $3000, will be awarded on April 1. Any person "who has shown marked ability in some field of study and has in progress work, the results of which promise to constitute important additions to our knowledge, shall be deemed eligible to appointment". Applications must be filed with the Dean of the Graduate School, The Ohio State University, not later than March 1.

Bertha E. Josephson, editorial associate of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* is working on a "Handbook for Historical Writing". For her chapter on footnote construction she invites historians to submit examples of typical, and also of particularly difficult, specimens in footnote citation for the following fields: ancient, far-eastern, medieval, modern European, Hispanic-American, Canadian, and English history. She is especially interested in examples of archival material and unpublished manuscript references in these fields. Suggestions should be addressed to her at 104 Hitchcock Hall, Western Reserve University.

The Bibliographical Society of America contemplates expanding the "Notes and Queries" section of its News Sheet to include as nearly as possible notices of all bibliographies planned or in process of compilation by members of the constituent societies of the American Council of Learned

Societies and by other American scholars. The record of published bibliographies is provided in various other ways, but in only a few of our disciplines is any systematic attention given to bibliographies in progress. The duplication of effort in such work is particularly tiresome, whether it be the work of compiling for publication or merely for the preparation of some piece of research. The Bibliographical Society of America, therefore, hopes to render an acceptable service in providing a current record of bibliographical projects. Notes for publication in the News Sheet may be addressed to Henry B. Van Hoesen, Secretary of the Bibliographical Society of America, Brown University Library.

The Historical Records Survey has added to its program the compilation of a comprehensive inventory of early American imprints, which will be carried on under the general direction of Luther H. Evans, national supervisor of the survey. The titles recorded will be filed at the Chicago office of the survey and eventually sent to the Union Catalogue of the Library of Congress. The national supervisor invites the co-operation of librarians and historians throughout the country in advising on procedure in their own and other institutions and requests that communications be sent to Douglas C. McMurtrie (2039 Lewis Street, Chicago), who has been appointed historical advisor to the national supervisor. It is believed that the number of eighteenth century titles recorded in Charles Evans's *American Bibliography* can be doubled and that many thousands of new titles will be added to the Union Catalogue.

PERSONAL

Louis Eisenmann, professor of Central European history at the Sorbonne, died on May 14. Professor Eisenmann was born at Hagenau, Alsace, in 1869 but moved with his family to the interior of France after the annexation of the province by Germany. Among the more important works of this distinguished scholar may be mentioned: *Le compromis austro-hongrois de 1867* (1904); *La Tchécoslovaquie* (1921); parts of Miliukov's *Histoire de la Russie* (1932); and *Un grand Européen, Edouard Benès* (1934). Professor Eisenmann was an editor of the *Revue historique* and of *Le monde slave* and an active director of the Centre d'études de politique étrangère and of the Institut d'études slaves.

Professor Stanoje Stanojević died at the end of July in Vienna. After having studied in Vienna he became in 1905 professor of Serb history at the newly founded university of Belgrade. He was a member of the Yugoslav peace delegation at Paris in 1919. His best known work is *Istorija srpskog naroda* (1908). He was also editor of the *Narodna enciklopedija srpsko-hrvatsko-slovenačka* and of the *Istoriski časopis*, the official organ of the Yugoslav historians, founded in 1935.

On September 17 Robert Davidsohn died in Florence. Born on April 26,

1853, in Danzig, he pursued a successful career in journalism, becoming joint proprietor and editor of one of the leading liberal newspapers of Germany, the *Berliner Börsencourier*. At the age of thirty-three he decided to take up historical studies, and in 1888 he received his Ph.D. at the University of Heidelberg. His intimate friendship with Ferdinand Gregorovius, the author of *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, inspired Davidsohn to become a historian of medieval Florence. In 1889 he settled down in Florence and lived there until his death, residing in Germany only during the World War. His *Geschichte von Florenz*, published between 1897 and 1927 and dealing mainly with the period from the eleventh to the middle of the fourteenth century, has a wider scope than its title would seem to indicate. Davidsohn presented in it a complete picture of the growth of one of the most important medieval cities, employing critically all available documentary and other materials. He threw new light particularly on the rise of early capitalism and on the related social and constitutional problems. Davidsohn was a corresponding member of the Bayerische Akademie of Munich, of the Accademia dei Lincei of Rome, and of the British Academy.

Edward James Rapson, fellow of St. John's College and professor of Sanskrit at Cambridge University, died suddenly on October 3. He was born at West Bradley (Somerset) in 1861 and was educated at Hereford Cathedral School and at St. John's, from which he was graduated in 1884. From 1887 to 1906 he was assistant in the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum and also professor of Sanskrit at University College, London. In 1906 he was called to Cambridge. He worked chiefly on Indian history and numismatics. In the former field he wrote *The Struggle between England and France for Supremacy in India* (London, 1887) and *Ancient India* (Cambridge, 1914) besides editing the first volume of the *Cambridge History of India* (Cambridge, 1922) and *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan* (with A. M. Boyer and E. Senart, 3 vols., Oxford, 1920-29); and in the latter he was the author of *Indian Coins* for the *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* (Strasbourg, 1897) and *Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, the Traikūṭaka Dynasty, and the "Bodhi" Dynasty* for the *British Museum Catalogue of Indian Coins* (London, 1908).

Nicholas Kaltchas died suddenly in New York on October 25 at the age of forty-three. Born in Thrace and educated at Robert College, Constantinople, he came to the United States in 1919 as a member of a commission of Thracian Greeks. He was for a time connected with the Greek legation and collaborated in a number of Greek periodicals. In 1921 he obtained from Columbia University the degree of Master of Arts, was Cutting Fellow in 1927, and in 1930 was awarded a fellowship for the purpose of collecting material for an important work on the Greek constitution. This

he finished immediately before his death. He taught at the universities of Montana, Washington, and Michigan, and at Sarah Lawrence College. Mr. Kaltchas was an acknowledged authority on Near Eastern affairs and wrote a series of pamphlets on these subjects of which the latest, entitled *Post-war Politics in Greece,* was published by the Foreign Policy Association in 1936. An *Introduction to the History of the United States* (1929), written in Greek, had a wide circulation and was republished in Athens. Twenty years of valiant struggle with ill-health prevented Mr. Kaltchas from giving the full measure of his remarkable powers, but both as historian and teacher the breadth and clarity of his mind and his high intellectual integrity were evident.

The death of Elie Faure on October 30 removed from the world of art criticism one of its most picturesque characters. Born in 1873, he showed, even in youth, an abnormally emotional sensitivity to art. He largely abandoned his profession of medicine in 1900, though he returned to it during the World War, to become art critic for *L'Aurore,* with which he had come in contact during the Dreyfus case. His first important essay in criticism, *Velasquez,* appeared in 1904. From then on a steady stream of books flowed from his pen. Several monographs on recent painters indicate a keen sympathy with progressive art, for example, *Eugène Carrière* (1908), *Henri Matisse* (1920), *Cézanne* and *Derain* (1923), and *Soutine* (1930). His literary effort was not confined to the visual arts. His *Napoléon* was published in 1921; a concern with literature inspired *Montaigne et ses trois premiers-nés* (1926); while his world-wide travels bore fruit in *Mon Périple* (1932). The five-volume *History of Art,* his most considerable work, appeared between 1909 and 1927 (translated later by Walter Pach). M. Faure's fundamental thesis, that art is a social expression, would find many supporters today. Pushed to an extreme, that the artist is rather the mouthpiece of his time in visual form than a creator, it is less clear. But if that attitude is perhaps acceptable, his emotional nature colors his writing so strongly with purple passages that the force of his thesis is too often obscured. To some, such an interpretation may be intensely stimulating; to many it is vague and unintelligible. Aesthetics is quite difficult enough to grasp without clouding it in a haze of emotions. Yet if such a treatment attracts new devotees to enthusiasm for art, it has its place and value.

Frank Cundall, dean of West Indian historians, died at his home in Kingston, Jamaica, on November 15 at the age of 79. A native of England, he was educated at King's College, London, and spent the following decade in editing art publications. In 1891 he became secretary and librarian of the Institute of Jamaica, which post he held until his death. He was one of the colony's most distinguished citizens and a scholar of world-wide repute. Under his vigorous direction the institute became a cultural force of paramount importance in Caribbean life and a leading research center

in the British Empire. Mr. Cundall's works on Jamaican history are legion. Best known are *Bibliographia Jamaicensis* (1902), *Biographical Annals of Jamaica* (1904), *Bibliography of the West Indies* (1909), *Historic Jamaica* (1915), *The Press and Printers of Jamaica prior to 1820* (1916), and *The Governors of Jamaica in the Seventeenth Century* (1936). A companion volume to the latter, covering the 1700's, appeared just before his death. He served as coeditor of the annual *Handbook of Jamaica* from 1907 to 1919 and as editor in chief since 1920. He was a member of numerous historical societies, a fellow of the Society of Arts, and an officer of the Order of the British Empire and of the French Academy. Mr. Cundall was a man of great personal charm who won the respect and admiration of all students of European expansion with whom he came into personal contact. Many others knew him through correspondence. The personification of generosity, he provided West Indian specialists with huge numbers of transcripts covering papers in his custody and sought nothing in return. He, more than any other individual, gave impetus to Caribbean studies during the present century.

In the National Archives W. R. Willoughby, formerly a deputy examiner in the Division of Accessions, has been promoted to be chief of the Division of Treasury Department Archives, and Gaston L. Litton, who has been editing the messages and papers of the chiefs of the Five Civilized Tribes at the Oklahoma Historical Society under the direction of the department of history of the University of Oklahoma, has been appointed to this division. James R. Mock, formerly professor of history in Findlay College, has been appointed as a classifier; G. Leighton LaFuze has been promoted to the position of assistant classifier; and Gerald J. Davis, sometime professor of political science in the University of Santa Clara, has been appointed as assistant in the Division of Justice Department Archives.

The appointment of Dr. William D. McCain of the Division of Classification of the National Archives to the position of Director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History to succeed the late Dunbar Rowland is a gratifying recognition of the value of professional experience in the field of archival economy. Dr. McCain takes up his new duties on January 1, 1938.

Announcement has been made of the appointment of Gustave Lanctot as Archivist of the Dominion of Canada. Dr. Lanctot is a leader in French-Canadian historical scholarship and has been connected with the Public Archives of Canada for many years.

Leonid I. Strakhovsky, formerly of the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, is now professor of European history at the University of Maryland.

J. Orin Oliphant of Bucknell University has been made associate professor of history.

In our last issue (p. 239) mention was made of the resignation of Professor Frank J. Klingberg as chairman of the history department of the University of California at Los Angeles. To prevent possible misunderstanding it should have been added that Dr. Klingberg remains at the university as professor of English history.

Louis K. Koontz, associate professor of history in the University of California at Los Angeles, is in residence during this semester at William and Mary College as occupant of the newly established chair of colonial history there. In his absence from California John W. Caughey is acting editor of the *Pacific Historical Review*. Two other associate professors in the same university will be absent on leave during the coming semester: Roland D. Hussey, who will be engaged in archival and field studies of the lands bordering on the Caribbean Sea; and David K. Bjork, who will carry on research in Belgium in the history of Hanseatic-Flemish relations and will take part in the International Congress of Historical Sciences at Zurich in August. Professor Godfrey Davies, member of the research staff of the Huntington Library and editor of its new *Quarterly*, will offer a seminar in Stuart England during the second semester of the current academic year, beginning in February.

Professor John E. Pomfret has resigned as associate professor of history in Princeton University to become dean of the Senior Section and of the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University.

Professor Curtis H. Walker of Vanderbilt University, who is on leave of absence for the current academic year, is engaged in research in France and England.

COMMUNICATIONS

THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

In the July issue of the *American Historical Review* (XLII, 708-9) you published Mr. James Bunyan's review of Professor George Vernadsky's *Political and Diplomatic History of Russia*. In my opinion this review does great injustice to a book which I consider an important contribution to the literature of Russian history. Every criticism, no matter how severe, should be welcomed if it is fair, accurate, and competent. It seems to me that, unfortunately, Mr. Bunyan's review does not satisfy these requirements. A few examples will suffice to demonstrate the nature of his criticism.

Mr. Bunyan accuses Professor Vernadsky of "cursory treatment of important events", on the one hand, and of "completely confusing" the reader by unnecessary detail, on the other. We are told by the reviewer that while "the Congress of Vienna is dismissed in eight lines", Mr. Vernadsky, in the earlier part of the book, "allots over one hundred pages to the enumeration of several hundred sovereign princes", etc. But anyone who consults the book will discover that the one hundred pages in question, in addition to covering the political history of Russia over some five hundred years, deal also with the social and religious development of the period. Likewise, the Congress of Vienna, contrary to the reviewer's assertion, is not "dismissed in eight lines" but is discussed, in its relation to Russia's policies, on pages 289-92.

In another place the reviewer charges Professor Vernadsky with being "somewhat confused" on the Ukrainian issue. According to Mr. Bunyan, the author "argues at some length in favor of a separate Ukrainian nationality" (there is no such argument in the book), "and yet tells us that throughout the centuries the Ukrainians . . . looked upon themselves primarily as Russians". What Mr. Vernadsky actually does is to state the fact that the development of national consciousness among the Ukrainians is a comparatively recent phenomenon. The confusion is in the mind of the reviewer himself, who has failed to understand the perfectly clear meaning of the author. In dismissing some of Professor Vernadsky's historical analogies as "naive and superficial", Mr. Bunyan finds it possible to assert that Ivan the Terrible's conflict was only with "some of his boyars" and that the *poteshnye* of Peter the Great were nothing else but "mere playmates of the young czarevich". Yet the social objectives of Ivan's policies have been made sufficiently clear by Russian historical scholarship, and every student of Russian history should know the important part which Peter's "playmates" performed in building up both his political power and the modern Russian army.

I am forced to come to the conclusion that Mr. Bunyan's sweeping condemnation of Professor Vernadsky's book rests on very flimsy foundations indeed.

Harvard University. MICHAEL KARPOVICH.

THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:

At the very beginning of my reply to Professor Karpovich I should like to state that there was no "sweeping condemnation" of Professor Vernadsky's book

in my review but only a condemnation of specific features and in respect to certain uses, as that of a textbook. Furthermore, this condemnation did not rest on the contentions which Professor Karpovich selected for his criticism but solely on the fact that the book appeared to me to contain a large number of factual errors. In view of those errors I stated that the book was well-nigh useless as a textbook and that it should not have been allowed to appear "in its present form", that is, without considerable checking and revision. Professor Karpovich ignores completely the part of my review dealing with factual inaccuracies and lays chief emphasis on certain critical comments of mine which in themselves are not of sufficient importance to justify condemnation of a book or, for that matter, of a reviewer who made them. But since Professor Karpovich takes me severely to task on such grounds I am obliged to consider the issues raised in his letter.

1. My complaint about the unnecessarily detailed treatment of the early period of Russian history was not merely that Professor Vernadsky gave too much space to that period but also that he presented his material in a way that taxes heavily the attention of the reader and obscures his historical perspective by the agglomeration of proper names and unimportant details. Such a treatment of a period of which so many of the incidents described are still matters of controversy seemed to me particularly out of place in a book which allots only a few lines to such important events as the Congress of Vienna. The four pages which Professor Karpovich cites as concerned with the Congress are merely pages on which it, together with the liquidation of its results, is alluded to; actually there are only twelve and a half lines devoted to it. Similarly, it was surprising to me that a history written primarily for American students should contain so little about Russian-American relations.

2. Professor Karpovich accuses me of failure to understand "the perfectly clear meaning" of Professor Vernadsky's presentation of the Ukrainian problem and of ascribing to him arguments not contained in the book. I can best explain the grounds of my criticism by quoting a few passages from Professor Vernadsky's book. Describing conditions in the Ukraine during the reign of Catherine the Second, Professor Vernadsky declares that "the former [Ukrainian] Cossack *starshina* now had sold its nationalistic aspirations for the mess of pottage of corporate privileges" (pp. 269-70), and that as a result of Catherine's policies "the Left Bank Ukraine ceased to exist as a separate political body" (p. 270). Early in the nineteenth century "the wave of Russification was felt in the Left Bank Ukraine as well" (p. 298), and "the general rise . . . of nationalism in the first quarter of the nineteenth century had swept Ukraine as well" (p. 328). It is also said that "the same policy of Russification which had been applied to Poland after the uprising of 1863 was extended to the Ukrainian nation as well" (p. 326). Yet, despite all these attestations of Ukrainian nationalism, we are told that "up to the end of the nineteenth century . . . the population not only of Great Russia but of Ukraine as well thought of themselves simply as Russians" (p. 331). This assertion seems definitely inconsistent with the rest.

3. I was somewhat surprised to read Professor Karpovich's statement that "the social objectives of Ivan's policies have been made sufficiently clear by Russian historical scholarship". The very opposite seems to me to be true. Ever since S. Solovev attempted to interpret Ivan's madness in terms of social objectives by the application of Hegelian dialectics Russian historians have been sharply divided in their interpretation of Ivan's conflict with his boyars and, for that matter, with the rest of Russian society of his day. So marked is this divergence of opinion that many an eminent scholar refuses to admit that social objectives were at all

at stake in this conflict. I cannot therefore agree that Professor Vernadsky's theory, according to which Ivan planned a "revolution from above", aiming at the "liquidation" of the boyars as a class and the elevation of the petty gentry, is the generally accepted theory. It is the view of S. Platonov but not of B. Kliuchevsky, to mention only two distinguished Russian scholars of recent years. In analyzing the causes of the czar's conflict with his boyars, Kliuchevsky comes to the conclusion that Ivan's anger was directed not against a system, political or social, but against individuals (Kurs, 4th ed., Part II, p. 236). It is well known that after he divided his state into the *zemshchina* and the *oprichnina* Ivan left the government of the former to the boyars, and that within the *oprichnina* were included representatives of the boyar aristocracy. This does not look like "liquidating" the boyars as a class. These were some of the reasons why I stated that Ivan's conflict was not with boyardom as such but with those of his boyars whom in his persecution mania the czar suspected of disloyalty. That number was great indeed, and it included not only boyars but also representatives of the clergy, merchants, and common people. For similar reasons I considered Professor Vernadsky's attempt to interpret sixteenth century struggles in terms of twentieth century communist ideology as superficial. Even more superficial appeared to me the analogy between the *poteshnye* of Peter the Great and the *comsomol*. One could pick at random any institution engaged in the training of youth for political and military leadership and maintain that it resembles the *comsomol*. The assertion would be true but trivial.

JAMES BUNYAN.

The Walter Hines Page School of International Relations.